REPORT RESUMES

ED 019 390 24 UD 006 402

PREJUDICES AND OTHER INTERRACIAL ATTITUDES OF NEGRO YOUTH.
FINAL REPORT, 15 JUN 66-31 AUG 67.
BY- MCDOWELL, SOPHIA F.
HOWARD U., WASHINGTON, D.C., DEPT. OF SOCIOLOGY
REPORT NUMBER BR-6-8520 PUB DATE 67
GRANT OEG-2-6-068520-1723
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$7.44 184P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CAUCASIANS, *NEGRO STUDENTS, *RACIAL ATTITUDES, *NEGRO ATTITUDES, *SOCIAL RELATIONS, RACE RELATIONS, ETHNIC STEREOTYPES, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, SEX DIFFERENCES, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, SCHOOL INTEGRATION, EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE, QUESTIONNAIRES, RESEARCH, TABLES (DATA), HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, DROPOUTS, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP, PARENTAL BACKGROUND,

A STUDY WAS CONDUCTED TO INVESTIGATE THE WILLINGNESS OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL AGE YOUTH TO ASSOCIATE WITH WHITES. DATA WERE GATHERED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED TO 471 NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS AND 111 NEGRO DROPOUTS FROM SOUTHERN AND BORDER STATES. THE STUDY INVESTIGATED SUCH VARIABLES AS THE YOUTHS' SEX, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, EDUCATIONAL STATUS (DROPOUT OR STAY-IN), SCHOOL DESEGREGATION EXPERIENCES, AND INFORMAL VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION WITH WHITE PEERS. IT ALSO SOUGHT TO DETERMINE ON WHAT BASIS THE NEGRO YOUTHS CHOSE OR REJECTED NEGRO AND WHITE ASSOCIATES. THE INDEX OF INTERRACIAL ATTITUDES USED IN THE STUDY WAS BASED ON THE INDICATED DEGREE OF WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE IN 15 DIFFERENT INTERRACIAL SITUATIONS. THE FINDINGS INDICATE THAT THERE WAS NOT AS MUCH RACIAL PREJUDICE AMONG THE YOUTHS AS HAD BEEN ASSUMED. MOREOVER, THE NEGRO YOUTHS' WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE WITH WHITES VARIED WITH SITUATION, EDUCATIONAL STATUS, EXTENT OF INFORMAL, VOLUNTARY EXPERIENCE WITH WHITE PEERS, AND THE KINDS OF WHITES PERCEIVED. MOST IMPORTANT, THE WILLINGNESS OF THE NEGROES TO ASSOCIATE WAS GOVERNED BY ANTICIPATION OF THE REACTIONS OF WHITES TO THE ASSOCIATION. (LB)

BR-6-8520
P.A. 24
06402

ED019390

PREJUDICES AND OTHER INTERRACIAL ATTITUDES OF NEGRO YOUTH

Final Report to Office of Education Department of Health, Education and Welfare

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 006 402

Principal Investigator:
Sophia F. McDowell
Department of Sociology
Howard University

Grant Number: OEG-2-6-068520-1723
Project Number: 6-8520
Period: 6-15-66 through 8-31-67

24

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Much of the research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

However, if I were to name all the people whose personal and professional assistance over a two-year period have made the study possible, the list of acknowledgements would be as long as the research itself. These I cannot resist mentioning:

the many students in my sociology classes at Howard University through continued association with whom I have learned the disutility of the term "the Negro" and have become permanently sensitized--though many say "no white person will ever understand what it means to be a Negro"--to the routine cruelties of our customs and our language that separate Negroes out from the rest of society. For examples: the way the "we" and the "they" are white-oriented even in sociology text books; the way the language uses "black" for bad and "white" for good, even outside of racial contexts; and even the way pharmaceutical houses advertise "skin-colored" band-aids that are pale pink, and toy manufacturers produce white dolls;

the thousands of pre-test subjects who talked so freely to my student-researchers; the 582 research subjects in this study, their administrators and supervisors in and out of school; Mr. John D. Koontz, Assistant Superintendent-in-Charge of Junior and Senior High Schools, District of Columbia Board of Education, who helped us gain access to the senior high schools;

my colleagues and the staff of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Howard University, and particularly the Department Head, G. Franklin Edwards, who facilitated my research in very many ways;

the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago and Philip M. Hauser, who as Department Chairman welcomed me back to Ph.D. candidacy more than twenty years after I had first undertaken doctoral studies; and particularly David Street, who with Morris Janowitz was my dissertation committee, and whose guidance was constantly available and helpful, supplementing when my work was inadequate and complimenting when it was good so that in each case I was encouraged to continue to completion;

the several young people employed on this project in questionnaire administration, data processing and clerical work; Mercedee Ball, Naomi Bettelheim, Karl Drake, Tom Parker and Nancy Miller, who contributed their enthusiasm also and the understanding that the generations are still another gap it takes a lot of empathy to cross;

Janet M. Silard, gentle friend, harsh critic, competent research-editorial assistant,

and--hardest to express--my gratefulness and pride for my family--my four children, who good-naturedly shared a household with a Ph.D. candidate who was a part-time mother; and my husband, Arthur J. McDowell, who graciously (most of the time) accepted the double inconvenience of having a career woman and a scholar for a wife, and gave unstintingly of his wisdom, his expertise and his love.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES . . . .

Chapter

I. GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE INVESTIGATION 1

- Introduction
- Related Literature
- The Pre-tests
- Hypothesis
- The Sample
- Instrumentation and Analysis

II. THE SAMPLE 16

III. THE WILLINGNESS-TO-ASSOCIATE ATTITUDE AND HOW IT VARIES . . . 27

- Introduction
- The Sex Differential in Willingness to Associate
- In-School/Out-of-School Differences

IV. THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFLUENCES ON WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE . . 50

- Parental Occupation Variable
- Parental Education Variable
- Occupation Mobility Aspiration Variable

V. THE SCHOOL EXPERIENCE VARIABLE 70

- Introduction
- School Desegregation Experience
- Experience with White Teachers
- Informal Voluntary Contact with White Fellow Students

VI. PATTERNS OF PREFERENCE FOR WHITE AND NEGRO ASSOCIATES . . . 89

- Introduction
- Basis for Choosing White Associates
- Personal Interracial Attitudes
- Interracial Principles
- Non-Interracial Attitudes
- Class Characteristics
- Basis for Rejecting Whites
- Class Characteristics
- Basis for Choosing Negro Associates
- Development of Interracial Attitudes
- Conclusion

Chapter
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS 115

The Extent of Willingness to Associate With Whites
Situational Differentials in Willingness
In-School/Out-of-School Differentials in Willingness
School Experience Differential in Willingness
The "Kinds of Whites" Differential in Willingness
The Concept of Prejudice
  Ethnocentrism
  Institutional Sanction
  Irrationality
  Rigidity
  Antipathy
The Contingency Factor
Shortcomings and Limitations
  The Sample
  The Focus on Attitudes
  The Questions Asked
  Schedule Construction
  Response, Reliability, and Validity
  Questionnaire Administration
Other Perspectives in Examining Negro Views of Whites
Interpretations
In Retrospect and Prospect

APPENDIXES

A. THE PRE-TESTS 146

B. THE INSTRUMENT 159

C. THE SERENDIPITOUS EXPERIMENT 166

BIBLIOGRAPHY 172

LIST OF TABLES

Table | | Page
Table 1. Birthplace in Per Cent of Sample and Subsamples 16

2. Per Cent of Respondents Domiciled With Parents and/or Other . 17

3. Parental Education in Per Cent of Sample 19

4. Education of Negro Adults in Per Cent in Washington and in Sample 20

5. Parental Occupations in Per Cent of Sample 21

6. Per Cent of Male and Female By Occupational Categories Washington, D. C. and Sample 22

7. Respondents' Personal Occupational Aspirational Level as Compared With Achieved Occupational Level of Parents 23

8. Religious Affiliation in Per Cent of Sample and Subsamples . . 25

9. Willingness to Associate Scores in Each of Fifteen Situations 28

10. Willingness to Associate in Intimate and Non-Intimate Situations by Mean Willingness Scores and Per Cent Completely Willing 38

11. Willingness to Associate in Three Groups of Varying Racial Composition Per Cent of Complete Willingness and Mean Willingness Score 40

12. Willingness to Associate Scores on Each of 15 Activities, By Sex 41

13. Percentages Completely Willing to Associate in Different Activities By Sex and Subsample 45

14. Percentages Completely Willing to Associate in Different Activities By Sex and Subsample 46

15. Per Cent of Members of Each Subgroup Cross-Classified By Independent Socio-Economic Variables 52

16. Per Cent of Members of Each Subgroup in Designated Levels of Willingness to Associate Cross-Classified By Independent Socio-Economic Variables 53

Table | Page

17. Mean Index of Willingness to Associate for In-School and Out-of-School Respondents By Parental Occupational Categories . . 55

18. Degree of Relationship Between Parental Occupation and Willingness to Associate Index as Measured By Gamma Coefficient By Sex and School Status 59

19. Mean Index of Willingness to Associate for In-School and Out-of-School Respondents By Parental Education Categories . 60

20. Degree of Relationship Between Parental Education and Willingness to Associate Index as Measured By Gamma Coefficient By Sex and School Status 62

21. Mean Index of Willingness to Associate for In-School and Out-of-School Respondents By Mobility Ambitions 67

22. Degree of Relationship Between Respondents' Own Occupational Mobility Ambition and His Willingness to Associate Index as Measured By Gamma Coefficient By Sex and School Status . . 68

23. Mean Index of Willingness to Associate Classified By Extent of Desegregation and Sex and School Status 75

24. Degree of Relationship Between Respondent's Integrated School Experience and His Willingness to Associate Index as Measured By Gamma Coefficient By Sex and School Status . . 76

25. Willingness to Associate Index for All Respondents Classified By School Status and Sex Cross-Classified By Experience with White Teacher 78

26. Degree of Relationship Between Respondents' Experience with White Teachers and Willingness to Associate Index as Measured By Gamma Coefficient By Sex and School Status . . . 80

27. Willingness to Associate Index for All Respondents Classified By School Status and Sex Cross-Classified By Evaluation . . . 81

28. Per Cent of Members of Each Subgroup Cross-Classified By Extent of Voluntary Informal Association with White Fellow Students 82

29. Degree of Relationship Between Respondents' Dealings with White Fellow Students in School and His Willingness to Associate Index as Measured By Gamma Coefficient By Sex and School Status 83

30. Per Cent of Members of Each Subgroup With Designated Levels of Willingness Cross-Classified By Informal Voluntary Dealings With White Fellow Students 85

Table Page

31. Degree of Relationship Between Respondents' Dealings With Fellow Students Out of School and His Willingness to Associate Index as Measured By Gamma Coefficient By Sex and School Status 87

32. Kinds of Whites with Whom Respondents are Willing to Associate. 94

33. Kinds of Whites with Whom Respondents are Unwilling to Associate 95

34. Kinds of Negroes Respondents are "Most Willing to Associate With" (Percentages of Respondents Designating Each Kind) . . . 103

35. Kinds of Negroes Respondents are "Most Unwilling to Associate With" (Percentages of Respondents Designating Each Kind). . . 104

CHAPTER I

GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE INVESTIGATION

Introduction

The interracial attitudes of members of minority groups toward the dominant group have been insufficiently recognized and little studied. Sociologists have concentrated on dominant group prejudice against minorities. However, in view of what we know about the nature of social interaction, the existence of some sort of prejudice could be anticipated, sociologically and logically, on both sides of the two-way barrier between the groups; its prevalence is confirmed by even superficial observation. Indeed, the "race problem" in the United States today is complicated by negative Negro attitudes toward whites as well as by white prejudices toward Negroes.

In the past it was quite usual for most writers on the American race problem to regard the Negro as the passive recipient of white judgments and hostilities. More recently a new awareness of Negro attitudes toward whites has come with the national ferment concerning race and the changing status of the Negro. Negro self-assertiveness in the non-violence movement, in headline-making riots, and in declarations of Black Power, as well as the growing pride in Negritude, highlight the need for interracial attitude research in which the Negro is the subject, not merely the object. Such is the focus of the present project, which deals with the interracial attitudes of a sample of Negro youth living in Washington, D. C. It is based principally on questionnaire data collected in the spring of 1966 from both male and female high school pupils and drop-outs. It seeks to understand the situational components of interracial perspectives and to account for the variations in attitudes on the basis of various background attributes. Prominent among the background characteristics are experiences connected with schooling.

Related Literature

Much has been written concerning the nature of prejudice, and there has been considerable scholarly research on white prejudice toward Negroes.[1] An abundant literature is available on the Negro in the United States and the race problem. There have been some empirical investigations of the "effects upon personality development of Negro youth of their membership in a minority group," which was the central theme of the American Youth Commission's six volumes in the 1940's.[2] Empirical studies on the specific subject of the Negro's attitudes toward whites are few and scattered, and since they vary so in methods, times, places and populations, it is not surprising that they yield differing, sometimes even contradictory, results. However, they do concur in finding some form or degree of prejudice in each of the samples studied.

---

[1] It is significant that even as recently as this year a volume entitled Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes which attempts to cover attitude research comprehensively and includes a chapter on "Ethnic and National Groups," has no examples of minority group attitudes toward white scales. While the authors recognize both the technical shortcomings of the many scales they present and the fact that "there are many scales measuring attitudes toward other specific ethnic and national groups. Thus there are no scales measuring attitudes toward the French, Mexicans or Americans. Such scales as these latter could have a great deal of applicability in research or international relations"--there is continued failure to appreciate the lack of scales measuring Negro attitudes toward whites. Marvin E. Shaw and Jack M. Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967), chapter viii, p. 413.

[2] Allison Davis and John Dollard, Children of Bondage (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1940); E. Franklin Frazier, Negro Youth at the Crossways (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1940); Charles S. Johnson, Growing Up in the Black Belt (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1941); W. Lloyd Warner et al., Color and Human Nature (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education American, 1941); Ira De A. Reid, In a Minor Key (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1940); Robert L. Sutherland, Color, Class and Personality (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1942).

The bibliography at the end of this study refers to the literature on the general topics mentioned above and also lists specifically the limited number of publications which report empirical studies of minority group prejudice. Several items merit special comment.

An early attempt to measure Negro prejudice was Eli Marks' adaptation of standard tests for white prejudice in Charles S. Johnson's Growing Up In the Black Belt (1941).[1] Analyzing the reliability of these tests later in an article in the Journal of Social Psychology, Marks recognized their marked limitations in getting at "the complexities of individual response" which "must be led to more intensive case analysis."[2]

In the 1940's also, James Bayton, Max Meenes, and other psychologists at Howard University[3] tested Negro students' stereotypes of American whites. In later investigations by Bayton, the socio-economic class of the white attitude-objects proved as important as race in determining Negroes' stereotypes of whites. Awareness of the salience of this class factor is significant in enhancing our recognition of the multi-dimensionality of so-called race prejudice. The class of the Negro respondents themselves was found to be relevant to the degree of their anti-white sentiments in University of Chicago Ph. D. dissertations by Mozell C. Hill (1946)[1] and Tilman Cothran (1949).[2]

---

[1] Charles S. Johnson, op. cit.

[2] Eli S. Marks, "Standardization of Race Attitude Tests for Negro Youth," Journal of Social Psychology, XVII (November, 1943), 276.

[3] J. A. Bayton, "The Racial Stereotypes of Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXXVI (1941), 97-102; J. A. Bayton, "Racio-National Stereotypes Held by Negroes," Journal of Negro Education, XVI (1947), 49-56; J. A. Bayton, L. J. Austin, and Kaye Burke, "Negro Perceptions of Negro and White Personality Traits," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, I (March, 1965), 250-53; J. A. Bayton, L. B. McAlister, and J. Hamer, "Race-Class Stereotypes," Journal of Negro Education, XXV (1956), 75-78; Max Meenes, "A Comparison of Racial Stereotypes of 1935-1942," Journal of Social Psychology, XVII (May, 1943), 327-36..

In a series of Indianapolis studies in the 1950's, involving Negro social distance prejudice Frank Westie found socio-economic class turned out to have double relevance both with regard to the Negro subject and the white "attitude object."

Of most recent importance are the Cornell Studies in Intergroup Relations, which include field investigations in five small industrial cities in different parts of the country from 1948 to 1952. The Cornell studies are distinguished by their conceptual and empirical approach to prejudice as a joint product of personal, social and situational determinants. Their major publication, When Strangers Meet,[3] includes one chapter on Negro prejudice toward whites. Here the correlates of Negro prejudice toward whites in the five project cities are compared with certain presumed correlates of white prejudice toward Negroes including, education, socio-economic status, age, marital status, sex, church, clique and organizational membership, interracial contacts, and certain psychological characteristics such as personal authoritarianism. While these comparisons cannot be summarized briefly because of variation in the prejudice indexes used in inconsistencies both in previous findings about white prejudice and in present findings in the five separate Negro communities, certain limited generalizations are possible. For example, among both Negro and white groups low prejudice is correlated with high education, single marital status, high social participation, and location outside of the South. Among Negroes, though not among whites, high occupational status is correlated with high social-distance feelings and females are consistently more prejudiced than males.

---

[1] Mozell C. Hill, "The All-Negro Society in Oklahoma" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1946).

[2] Tilman Cothran, "Negro Stereotyped Conceptions of White People" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1949).

[3] Robin M. Williams, Jr., Strangers Next Door (Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, 1964).

While the findings of the Cornell study do clarify many issues related to the nature and "causes" of prejudice, the distinction between Negroes' social-distance feelings in different kinds of situations is not adequately recognized, conflicting evidence and interpretations still remain. And even "truths" established in the 1950's are rendered questionable by the events of the last decade.

Interrelationships between prejudice and the student's educational attainment as investigated in many studies have been virtually summarized by Stember in Education and Attitude Change.[1] Among white subjects Stember concludes, stereotypes, are negatively correlated with education, but this is not true of social-distance feelings. A recent comprehensive survey of the institutional impact of segregated and desegregated school systems on prejudice is reported in Equality of Educational Opportunity,[2] a 1966 publication of the United States Office of Education. This investigation examines the characteristics of 4,000 schools with different racial compositions under a wide variety of circumstances. We find especially relevant the discussion of interracial attitudes in the summary report:

> An education in integrated schools can be expected to have major effects on attitudes toward members of other racial groups. At its best, it can develop attitudes appropriate to the integrated society these students will live in; at its worst, it can create hostile camps of Negroes and

---

[1] Charles H. Stember, Education and Attitude Change (New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1961).

[2] James Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 29.

> whites in the same school. Thus there is more to "school integration" than merely putting Negroes and whites in the same building, and there may be more important consequences of integration than its effect on achievement.[1]

A further analysis of these Office of Education data as well as the presentation of considerable additional data on a national scale, are included in an even more recent report on the extent and growth of racial isolation in urban schools, published in 1967 by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.

> The strategy consists of a broad-gauged approach, with four diverse but interlocking efforts. This involved, first, more detailed analyses of the data from the Equal Educational Opportunity survey. The second approach focused intensively on secondary school students in Richmond, California. The third effort extended to recent high school graduates, and the fourth approach dealt with two broad surveys of both Negro and white adults.[2]

The study concludes that attendance in segregated schools "tends to generate attitudes on the part of Negroes and whites that lead them to prefer association with members of their own race. The attitudes appear early in the schools, carry over into later life, and are reflected in behavior."[3]

The Pre-tests

The present project is a direct outgrowth of a series of researches carried out under my supervision by six classes of sociology students at Howard University. These exploratory studies had considerable usefulness methodologically, conceptually, and even substantively. Over a period of three years they involved several thousand Negro respondents of different ages, origins, regions of residence, occupation and education. The studies succeeded to some extent in assessing the wide range of hostile interracial attitudes, in the form of both stereotypes and feelings of social distance, and they observed the prevalence of non-hostile interracial feelings as well. It was possible to make some evaluation of the relationship of these feelings to a variety of demographic and social psychological data.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 29.

[2] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), II, 33.

[3] Ibid., I, 114.

Most importantly, the studies suggested hypotheses for the present investigation of minority group attitudes and offered extensive opportunity for pre-testing and improving our instruments. As a result of the pre-tests, we elected to study social distance feelings instead of stereotypes, because they seemed to be much better indices of interracial dispositions-to-act. We selected the term "are you willing to associate" rather than "do you wish," "would you find it distasteful." We offered the respondent the opportunity of expressing feelings of varying intensity, not merely yes or no; we increased the kinds of situations on which our index would be based; and, after exploration we decided not to ask the respondent to identify his own socio-economic class or to distinguish between different classes of whites, because we had found that answers in these terms were to some extent artifacts of our research.

There emerged from the exploratory researches a Weberian "ideal type" construct of the distinctive quality of minority group prejudice which underlies the present research. In a social interaction framework, we look upon Negro interracial attitudes as an accommodative process, typically differentiated from dominant group prejudice in being defensive rather than aggressive, derivative rather than original. We note that it bears the mark of a subordinate social status which in the present investigation we now identify as the "contingency factor." For this contingency factor we eventually derive the formula: "Negro interracial disposition depends on white interracial predisposition."

A more detailed description of the development of the present project through its various pre-test stages appears as Appendix A at the end of this thesis.

Hypothesis

This is an outline of propositions to be empirically tested. A general proposition, which underlies this research, concerns the distinctive character of minority group "Prejudice," its defensive, retaliative and tentative quality.

I. Willingness to associate varies with respect to the different types of activities and situations in which interracial participation is contemplated.

a. In general, there is an inverse relationship between the intimacy of the contact with its desirability.

b. However, in situations where the subject can be more confident of his own acceptability, an intimate contact may be approved (e.g., close friendship with one individual white is more acceptable than interracial social club membership. Social clubs with many Negro members are preferred over social clubs with few Negro members).

c. Interracial activities which involve the issue of equal economic and social opportunities (e.g., jobs and schools) are relatively more acceptable than others.

d. When given a choice, Negro youths prefer those interracial group situations which are preponderantly Negro.

II. Willingness to associate varies with respect to the different socio-economic classes of the Negro respondents.

III. Willingness to associate varies with respect to certain other demographic (e.g., sex, region of origin) characteristics.

IV. Willingness to associate varies with respect to the extent and nature of the previous school association with whites.

a. In general, those who have experienced greater school desegregation have greater willingness to associate.

b. However, the more influential variable is not the extent of school desegregation but the nature of the personal association with white fellow-students (i.e., its regularity, degree of intimacy, etc.).

c. Willingness to associate varies with the nature of the experience with white teachers, rather than the number of times the respondent has had a white teacher.

V. Willingness to associate varies also with respect to the different categories of whites perceived by the respondent. Categories may be based on such criteria as socio-economic class and/or whites' willingness to associate with Negroes, and/or attitudes toward civil rights, and/or psychological or moral characteristics, etc.

VI. The subject may explain his own willingness to associate (or unwillingness) not in terms of his own personal experience, but rather on the basis of other factors, such as, home conditioning, personal experience of "significant others," hearsay from personal source or public source, or history of the Negro in America during and since slavery.

Procedures

In the present research, the major dependent variable is the index representing the degree to which Negro youth are willing to associate with whites in diverse interracial situations. The principal independent variables are various measures of socio-economic status and of desegregated school experience.

The Sample

Through group-administered questionnaires, willingness-to-associate data and background data were collected from 582 high school seniors and drop-outs.

While the study design does not involve rigorous random or probability sampling, our 582 youth include some representation from all class segments of the District of Columbia youth population in the 16-19 years age group in spring, 1966.

With the cooperation of Mr. John D. Koontz, Assistant Superintendent of Junior High Schools and Senior High Schools of the District of Columbia, four high schools were selected to represent the socio-economic range of the Negro population in the city. Principals in each of these schools were then asked to assemble about 100 seniors, usually directly from homerooms which were composed alphabetically and/or from different tracks. These totalled 359 Negro respondents. (The 30 white students and one Oriental who also assembled in the school auditoriums for the research sessions were given a Form B of our basic questionnaire [Appendix A] which merely reversed the racial terms. These 31 were of course not included in our sample and their number was too small to justify a parallel investigation.)

Another in-school subsample consisted of 112 students from two vocational high schools, in two different communities. According to the Industrial and Adult Education Department of the District of Columbia Public Schools, vocational high school students in Washington are generally recruited from junior high school students who do not appear to be college-bound. The vocational school is often a last-stop suggestion for the potential drop-out. Of those who come, about 35 per cent are likely to finish the course and about 12 per cent go on to college.

Getting an out-of-school sample was much more complicated, because drop-outs are not usually assembled and accessible. With considerable effort, therefore, we collected 111 schedules from the following sources: 67 from a vocational training program, sponsored by the United Planning Organization[1] for eleven 16 and 17 year-old youths who are out of school, adrift, unskilled, unlearned and burdened with attitudes which prevent constructive participation in the usual vocational training program or the Neighborhood Youth Corps;[2] 14 from several neighborhood youth groups in a District Recreation Department program; 26 from an Office of Economic Opportunity job training program co-sponsored by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health; and four from a neighborhood youth corps group co-sponsored by a private settlement house. The in-school/out-of-school ratio of our sample approximates the school status of all Washington, D. C. youth, according to information provided by the District of Columbia Board of Education. It is also close to the 17 per cent drop-out rate for all high schools in the United States as reported in the 1966 Office of Education survey.[3]

Regrettably, our sex ratio is not balanced. There are 138 academic males, but 221 academic females. (This only very roughly reflects the sex composition of the academic high schools, which in October, 1966 was 8,945 males to 9,915 females.) Although the numbers of males and females in the Washington vocational schools is very close (1,544 males to 1,353 females in October, 1966), our 112 vocational students are all female, due to the availability of cooperating vocational schools at the time of the survey. The out-of-school youth we were able to reach were mainly male: 80 males to 31 females.

---

[1] The United Planning Organization, funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, is the central community action program for the entire District of Columbia area. In cooperation with neighborhood development centers and other local agencies, it sponsors a variety of anti-poverty programs.

[2] The United Planning Organization, "General Organization and Course of Outline for the Pre-Vocational Center" (Washington: Pre-Vocational Center, 1966), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

[3] Coleman et al., op. cit., p. 29.

Instrumentation and Analysis

Our basic instrument is a social-distance questionnaire, a copy of which is included as Appendix B. It lists 16 situations involving interracial association from which a willingness-to-associate index has been computed, in a manner described below. These sixteen items are important not only jointly for their potential significance in deriving this index, but individually, since each represents a practical interracial situation in which Negro youth may engage today. Some items involve issues of "first class citizenship," such as schools and jobs. Others seek reactions to those interracial situations which have become generally acceptable, such as having a white school teacher. Other items concern feelings about intimate personal contacts on both individual and group bases, such as dating, marriage, close friendship and social clubs. Purposefully, the social club, school, and church situations have each been divided into three separate sub-categories of racial composition: most members white; most members Negro; about half of the members white and half Negro. The differing degrees of willingness in the several sub-categories may help to distinguish between the avoidance that stems from dislike of all whites and the avoidance that stems from reluctance to be involved in a conspicuous, unfamiliar or otherwise uncomfortable social situation. To each of the sixteen questions, each of the 582 members of our sample responded with a number from 0 - 4, expressing the degree of willingness to associate with whites in the specified situations on this basis: 4 - completely willing, 3 - somewhat willing, 2 - unsure, 1 - somewhat unwilling, 0 - completely unwilling.

The index was constructed in this manner: using Pearsonian correlation, the responses to each of the sixteen items on the list was correlated with responses to each other individual item. Coefficients above .6 were obtained for only a few items. Ten items had correlations of .5 or above with other items on the list. The only item which had no coefficients of .4 or above with some other item was "working on a job as a boss over a white person." Accordingly, this item was eliminated as a component of the index, on the assumption that it did not measure the same factors as were involved in all the other items. All the other items were retained.

Clusters of correlations at the .4 coefficient and above were noted. The composition of these clusters ranged from 10 items (in the case of school, half and half) to two items (in the case of working on a job under a white person). Neither this nor any other analysis of the highly correlated items permits us to discriminate clearly the separate dimensions of the attitudes being tested.

Our willingness index is based on the fifteen items, averaged. While it may appear questionable to assign to each item on the list the same weight as every other--obviously "complete willingness" to marry is not equivalent interracially to "complete willingness" to have a white school teacher--nevertheless it is empirically likely that the refinements in measurement which could be achieved by the complicated process of weighting do not warrant the considerable efforts of that job.[1] Hopefully, the number and variety of items on this scale are such that the same or similar indexes would have the same or similar meaning for different individuals or different samples of individuals.

---

[1] William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods in Social Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1952), pp. 272-73.

We chose to make an overall numerical index rather than to attempt Guttmen scaling for the following reasons: First, it was clearly impossible to develop a scale for the entire set of items, because they represented diverse criteria of selection. For example, in some cases the crucial criterion was sexual intimacy; in others, the racial composition of the groups involved (i.e., their not being preponderantly white); alternatively individual familiarity with the activity involved was essential and in other cases, the degree of traditional or conventional acceptance in the respondent's community. Second, preliminary inspections of the data indicated inconsistencies even among items that seemed "naturals" for scaling. For example, interracial schools and churches were not invariably more acceptable than interracial social clubs, if the schools or churches were predominantly white while the clubs were predominantly Negro, or half and half. Third, it appeared that several small scales could be developed, but that they would be trivial, e.g., three-item scales based on the race composition of church, school, and clubs (as in Table 11). Finally, it was concluded after inspection of the data that a summary index would serve well heuristically, despite the difficulties in making assumptions of equal intervals between the 0 to 4 choices of willingness for each individual item between each of the sixteen individual items themselves, and about their individual weights.

While the number and types of items on our list were carefully selected to suit our purpose of having an overall measure for willingness to associate in the kinds of situations that seem most relevant for contemporary young Negroes, we recognized that the very process of averaging these items into a single index might mask situational differences in response. We therefore examined not merely the influence of our independent (i.e., socio-economic and school experience) variables on the mean willingness-to-associate indexes for each sex and school status subgroup of our population, but we also calculated a gamma coefficient between these independent variables and each of the 16 situations individually. Then in the case when strong relationships were observed, we evaluated their statistical significance on the basis of chi square tests.

On the questionnaire the social-distance items are followed by a series of open-end questions on (1) the kinds of whites the respondent is most willing to associate with or (2) most unwilling to associate with; (3) the kinds of Negroes the respondent is most willing to associate with or (4) most unwilling to associate with. This series is our substitute for the structural socio-economic class-of-whites question which we rejected after pre-testing. It also provides a way to examine our pre-test impression that some negative attitudes which seemed to discriminate between races of people, were really discriminating between kinds of people, the good kinds and the bad kinds.

Part II of the questionnaire is a personal information form which calls for certain classificatory demographic data, and for data on previous school associations, formal and informal, with white students and white teachers. These data were useful in discovering correlates of interracial attitudes among different segments of the Negro youth population, and assessing their relative importance.

CHAPTER II

THE SAMPLE

Our sample population, consisting of 471 high school seniors and 111 drop-outs, is primarily Washington born and bred. The 25 per cent who are not native Washingtonians are mostly from Southern and border states.[1]

TABLE 1

BIRTHPLACE IN PER CENT OF SAMPLE AND SUBSAMPLES

Subsample	Number	Birthplace			
		Per cent of Respondents[a]			
		D. C.	Border	South	Other
Totals	582	74	2	20	4
In-School	471	74	2	19	4
Drop-Out	111	71	2	25	3
Males	218	74	3	17	6
Academic	138	73	3	17	7
Drop-Out	80	75	2	19	4
Females	364	73	2	22	2
Academic	222	74	2	21	2
Vocational	112	76	2	18	4
Drop-Out	31	58	0	42	0

[a] Because of rounding, the percentages in these tables may not add up to 100.

---

[1] States classified as Southern include Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Those classified as border states include Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri and West Virginia.

There is some difference between the in-school and out-of-school populations in this regard. Slightly more of the out-of-school population are southern and border state people. The out-of-school population also appears to be somewhat less urban. For 76 per cent of them as compared to 88 per cent of the in-school population, a big city (with population of 100,000 or more) is their major region.[1] We defined as "major" the region where the respondent lived the largest number of years of his life.

Slightly less than 50 per cent of the total sample live with both parents. Fifty-four per cent of the academic youth share a home with both

TABLE 2

PER CENT OF RESPONDENTS DOMICILED WITH PARENTS AND/OR OTHER

		Per Cent of Respondents					
	Number	Father & Mother	Mother & No Father	Mother & Step-father	Father & No Mother	Father & Step-mother	Other No Answer
Total	582	47	28	9	4	2	11
In-School	471	49	28	7	4	2	10
Drop-Out	111	35	29	14	4	2	16
Males	218	47	27	12	4	3	8
Academic	138	54	26	8	4	2	6
Drop-Out	80	36	31	17	3	1	12
Females	364	46	29	7	4	2	11
Academic	221	54	25	5	3	2	11
Vocational	112	35	36	10	5	1	12
Drop-Out	31	33	33	6	6	0	22

---

[1] Tabulations of major region and of urban residence are not shown, but percentages are very similar to those presented in Table 1.

This low mobility, as well as large city background for the Washington, D. C. Negro, is corroborated in a survey conducted by public opinion analyst, parents as do only 35 per cent of the out-of-school youth. One-fourth or more of all the subgroups live only with their mothers: 25 per cent of the academics, 29 per cent of the drop-outs and a surprising 36 per cent of the vocationals.[1] But there are quite a few reconstituted families with an additional 7 per cent of the in-school population and 14 per cent of the out-of-school population reporting a step-father in the home.

While no one reported that his parents had had no schooling at all, the per cent of "don't know" and "no answers" was high, particularly with regard to the father's education. In fact, almost half of the out-of-school respondents and almost one-third of the in-school respondents gave no information about their fathers' education. To a lesser extent, 33 per cent of out-of-school and 16 per cent of in-school, respondents failed to give information about their mothers' education. In our total population and in all of our subsamples, the reported per cent of mothers completing high school exceeded the fathers by close to 10 per cent, although fathers were reported to have slightly more college experience. An expected education differential between academic parents and vocational and out-of-school parents is also evident from Table 3, whether one looks at the figures on high school

---

Louis Harris ("This is Washington--II," The Washington Post, October 3, 1966, pp. A 1 and A 8). Mr. Harris found that one in five Negroes living in the District of Columbia were born there and that three in four have lived there ten years or more. Of those coming to the area in the last ten years, slightly more than one-half are from a big city-suburbs background. It is suggested that the relative immobility of the Washington population is due to the large number of secure civil service jobs which in turn serve to stabilize the related business community.

[1] With regard to conventionality of family structure patterns, as well as other factors such as parental education and occupation, our sample compares favorably with those in other Negro communities studied. For instance, Williams, op. cit., p. 240 found that of the single Negro youths interviewed in Elmira, New York, 42 per cent did not live with their fathers, while 22 per cent were not domiciled with their mothers.

TABLE 3

PARENTAL EDUCATION IN PER CENT OF SAMPLE

		Education of Father				Education of Mother			
		Per Cent of Respondents				Per Cent of Respondents			
	Number	<H.S. Grad.	H.S. Grad.	>H.S. Grad.	Don't Know No Ans.	<H.S. Grad.	H.S. Grad.	>H.S. Grad.	Don't Know No Ans.
Total	582	26	24	15	35	33	34	15	19
In-School	471	25	26	17	31	32	35	16	16
Drop-Out	111	28	17	7	48	35	28	5	33
Male	218	27	26	20	27	28	34	20	18
Academic	138	27	27	28	17	24	36	28	12
Drop-Out	80	28	24	6	42	32	31	7	30
Female	364	25	23	13	39	35	33	11	20
Academic	221	21	28	15	36	30	36	16	18
Vocational	112	31	20	9	40	47	32	6	15
Drop-Out	31	31	0	9	59	39	19	0	42

completion or college experience. In comparison with non-whites in the United States as well as in Washington, D. C., the parents (particularly the fathers) of our sample population are relatively more educated.[1]

Similarly, the employment of the sample parents seems broader and steadier than is generally true for non-whites in the District of Columbia. Close to 60 per cent of the mothers in all the subsamples are said to have steady jobs, reflecting perhaps the peculiar employment conditions of this federal government city.[1] However, in less than one-fourth of the cases do these mothers provide the sole support of the family. Fathers are the sole support in somewhat more than one-fourth of the cases; and in a slightly larger percentage of the cases fathers and mothers both contribute. Only 5 per cent of our out-of-school population and even fewer in other subgroups, reported dependency on welfare. In several respects, the family background characteristics of vocational school students seem more similar to the dropouts than to the academics. This is so with regard to parental education (Table 3), family composition (Table 2) and parental employment (Table 5). The vocationals report a higher percentage of mothers being the sole support of the family than do any other group and a remarkably larger percentage

---

[1] In terms of education, the mothers and fathers of our sample population compare with the non-white male and female D. C. population in 1960, in the way shown in Table 4 on the next page.

TABLE 4

EDUCATION OF NEGRO ADULTS IN PER CENT IN
WASHINGTON AND IN SAMPLE

	< 4 Years	4 Years High	> 4 Years High
Males			
Sample	26	24	15
D. C.	66	16	14
Females			
Sample	33	34	15
D. C.	61	20	13

Notes:
Adapted from table showing years of school completed by non-white persons, twenty-five years of age and older in U. S. Census of Population 1960. District of Columbia. General Social and Economic Characteristics (U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census), pp. 10-32.

---

[1] A newspaper report of the Harris survey, "This is Washington, I" (The Washington Post, October 12, 1966, p. A22) observes that more than one-half of Washington's Negro adult women work.

Mr. Harris (The Washington Post, October 11, 1966, p. A6) states that for 23 per cent of the resident Negroes, the most appealing thing about Washington is its jobs.

TABLE 5

PARENTAL OCCUPATIONS IN PER CENT OF SAMPLE

Portion of Sample	Number	Father's Occupation					Mother's Occupation				
		Professional Business & Managerial	Sales, Clerics, etc.	Skilled & Semi-skilled	Labor & Domestic	Other, No Answer	Professional Business & Managerial	Sales, Clerics, etc.	Skilled & Semi-skilled	Labor & Domestic	Other, No Answer
Totals	582	12	11	26	19	32	12	17	6	28	37
In-School	471	14	11	25	20	30	13	19	5	25	37
Drop-Out	111	4	7	30	18	42	5	9	8	38	39
Males	218	16	11	27	14	32	15	18	8	23	36
Academic	138	23	13	27	11	27	19	23	6	15	37
Drop-Out	80	8	9	28	19	41	7	10	9	36	38
Females	364	10	10	25	23	32	10	16	5	32	38
Academic	221	13	12	23	21	31	12	20	5	22	40
Vocational	112	6	9	27	27	31	8	11	4	45	32
Drop-Out	31	6	0	6	26	61	6	3	26	19	45

of fathers not looking for work. This is understandable in light of the composition of the vocational sample as discussed in Chapter I.

The occupational distribution of our sample's parents (Table 5) resembles that of Washington, D. C.[1] Although over 30 per cent of the respondents are occupationally unclassifiable, 29 per cent of the mothers and 23 per cent of the fathers are reported to be in white collar occupations.

---

[1] Washington, D. C. occupational distribution percentages are not strictly comparable with our data, since male, female breakdowns are unavailable. However, using the figures for "employed civilian head" of family in the District, comparison indicates our occupational status to be generally a bit higher.

TABLE 6

PER CENT OF MALE AND FEMALE BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES, WASHINGTON, D. C. AND SAMPLE

	Prof., Prop., & Managerial	Sales, Clerics, etc.	Skilled & Semi-skilled	Labor & Domestic
D. C.	10	18	25	37
Sample Fathers	12	11	26	19
Sample Mothers	12	17	6	28

Notes:
Adapted from table, U. S. Census of Population 1960. District of Columbia. Detailed Characteristics, pp. 10-94.

Our sample's occupational distribution is also higher than that of most other Negro communities studied. For instance, in the Elmira, New York Negro population surveyed in the Cornell Studies in Intergroup Relations (1948-1956) "most Negroes were employed in semi-skilled or unskilled industrial positions; service occupations, like janitor, porter, attendant, waiter and busboy; and domestic service. Very few were in white collar occupations" (Williams, op. cit., p. 240). In view of our considerable number of "don't know" replies with regard to father's occupation, it is also interesting to note that one-third of the Negro youths surveyed in Elmira did not know their father's present occupation.

We asked our our respondents about their own occupational choices so we might have the possibility of testing whether there is any relation between mobility aspirations and extent of willingness to associate wih whites. Of the total population, 15 per cent looked forward to blue collar jobs, 75 per cent to white collar jobs, and 10 per cent were not possible to classify.

However, Table 7 shows a marked in-school/out-of-school differential: for instance, 50 per cent of the high school seniors, but only 15 per cent of the drop-outs aspire to professional, business and managerial vocations. Only 5 per cent of those in-school, but 30 per cent of the drop-outs hope for skilled and semi-skilled jobs. In-school/out-of-school percentages

TABLE 7

RESPONDENTS' PERSONAL OCCUPATIONAL ASPIRATIONAL LEVEL AS COMPARED WITH ACHIEVED OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL OF PARENTS[a]

Portion of Sample	Number	Respondents' Occupational Aspiration					Respondents' Occupational Aspirational Level			
		Professional & Managerial	Clerical	Skilled & Semi-skilled	Laborer & Domestic	Other, No Answer	Same Occupational Group	Higher Occupational Group	Lower Occupational Group	Other, No Answer
Totals	582	42	33	10	5	10	22	54	4	19
In-School	471	50	34	5	4	7	22	58	4	16
Drop-Out	111	15	27	30	7	22	22	38	5	35
Males	218	41	14	23	3	18	29	38	5	28
Academic	138	55	17	14	2	12	31	42	5	21
Drop-Out	80	14	10	41	5	31	25	30	6	40
Females	364	44	44	2	6	5	17	64	4	14
Academic	221	50	40	0	4	5	21	61	4	14
Vocational	112	39	44	4	7	6	13	71	4	11
Drop-Out	31	16	68	0	13	3	19	55	3	23

[a] In per cent of sample and subsample.

are most similar with regard to clerical aspirations. The fact that clerical goals are mentioned by very few of the drop-out males but by over two-thirds of the drop-out females probably reflects the nature of our sample. The males come mostly from a low-skilled vocational training program, while the females come from a project which provided some white collar job opportunities.[1]

Comparing the respondent's own occupational choice with the actual occupational level of his parents, the in-school populations of both sexes are consistently more mobile than the drop-outs.[2] However, the sex differential is very conspicuous. Sixty-four per cent of the females as compared with only 38 per cent of the males select occupations of a higher category than their parent. This differential holds for both academics and out-of-school groups.[1]

---

[1] It is interesting to note in Table 7 that a larger per cent of the vocationals indicated an occupational aspirational level higher than that of the parental occupational level than any other subsample. A dramatic contrast between background (already noted as close to the drop-outs) and goals is thus offered by the vocational whose future may be the most clearly defined of our groups. This will be explored further in relation to attitudinal factors in the next chapter.

[2] The Negro's low educational and occupational achievement syndrome has become one of the largely unquestioned assumptions of "the Negro problem," but it bears re-examining. In a recent comparative study in Washington, D. C. co-authored by this researcher, based on interviews with high income and low income parents concerning their aspirations for their children, a kind of education was found among both. There seemed to be a sharing of the American dream of "education" as the open sesame to all the goods and gains of the land. However, high income parents were realistic about how much education, what kind of education, and at what financed cost was required for specific vocational ambitions. Lower income parents merely used the term naively, almost magically. Their specific occupational aspirations were quite exclusively traditional fields open to Negroes in the past--teaching, medicine and ministry, while the upper income parents named less familiar and newer professional opportunities, like aeronautics, or radiological research. Part of the apparent class difference in emphasis turned out to be a matter of idiom--lower income parents were less prepossessing in the interviews: they volunteered less information; tended to be encouraged less by the interviewers for a fuller statement of their attitudes; and when they stated ultimate goals were less likely to speak in impressive abstractions like, "self-fulfillment" and "making a contribution to society" which was the middle class idiom (unpublished paper "The Relationships Between Class Status and Parental Aspirations in Negro Families" by Sophia F. McDowell and Elizabeth Huttman, delivered at the Pacific Sociological Society, 1966).

The plurality of our respondents are Baptists: 40 per cent of the entire sample and slightly varying proportions of each of our subsample. One-fifth of them are Catholics, and around 10 per cent Methodists.[2]

TABLE 8

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION IN PER CENT
OF SAMPLE AND SUBSAMPLES

		Religious Affiliation			
	Number	Baptists	Methodists	Catholics	Other
Totals	582	40	11	20	29
In-School	471	42	12	18	28
Drop-Out	111	33	8	25	32
Males	218	33	9	21	37
Academic	138	34	12	18	37
Drop-Out	80	32	5	25	38
Females	364	44	13	19	24
Academic	221	44	13	18	24
Vocational	112	47	12	19	23
Drop-Out	31	35	16	26	23

Over half of our respondents checked regular church attendance (i.e., going "about every Sunday" or "most Sundays") and the expected differentials in favor of greater attendance apply with regard both to the females as compared with males, and to the in-school as compared with the drop-out populations.

---

[1] This sex differential in ambition corresponds both to the historical reality of the dominance and responsibility of the Negro female and to occupational statistics demonstrating the greater vocational achievement of the Negro female.

[2] In comparison with the 1957 religious distribution of all non-whites in the United States, our population has a smaller per cent of Baptists and Methodists and a higher per cent of Catholics. ("Religion Reported by the Population, by Color, Sex and Residence: 1957," in U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States* [Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966], p. 40.)

Our sample reports little interracial school experience.[1] In their senior year, we know that 100 per cent of our seniors were in all or mostly-all Negro situations. Well over three-fourths report, so far as they are able to recall, that the racial composition of their classes in earlier years was also all or mostly all Negro in every grade. It does not seem surprising that for each grade the per cent of "do not remember" answers are much greater for the drop-outs than for the other subgroups, nor that failure to recollect the per cent of whites is greater with regard to the earlier grades rather than the more recent ones. But the large per cent of "do not remembers" does seem noteworthy. One wonders whether this is due to the minor importance of racial composition or alternatively to the fact that it is so important that it needs to be suppressed.[2]

---

[1] An article by Susan Filson, "Middle Classes Quit City Schools," The Washington Post, February 21, 1967, pp. F 1 and F 6, cites figures to show that only a very small minority of the D. C. public schools have sufficient numbers of Negroes and whites to provide real integration. For instance, she notes that Coolidge High School, which had more white students than any of the six from which our sample was drawn, is 90 per cent Negro.

With regard to the extent of desegregation in the entire nation, a 1966 report of the Office of Education summarizes, "More than 65 per cent of all Negro pupils in the first grade attend schools that are between 90 and 100 per cent Negro. And 87 per cent at grade 1, and 66 per cent at grade 12, attend schools that are 50 per cent or more Negro. In the South, most students attend schools that are 100 per cent white or Negro" (Coleman *et al.*, *op. cit.*).

[2] A reliability check of survey information given by students on the per cent of white persons in their classes in the past year finds over 17 per cent unreliability in the sixth grade which is the highest grade reported (*ibid.*, p. 570).

CHAPTER III

THE WILLINGNESS-TO-ASSOCIATE ATTITUDE AND HOW IT VARIES

Introduction

In view of the mass media emphasis on the current "Negro Revolution in America" our basic finding was not fully expected. There is a remarkably high general willingness to associate with whites on the part of our 582 Negro high school seniors and high school drop-outs in Washington, D. C., Spring, 1966.

Further evidence that the general frame of mind at the time of our study was not so violent as some headlines would lead us to expect comes from a September, 1966 Lou Harris opinion poll. In a table showing how Negroes ranked their leaders, Dr. King, James Meredith and Jackie Robinson topped the list: in its last three places were Floyd McKissick, Stokely Carmichael and Elijah Muhammad.[1]

Table 9 gives an overview of the responses of our entire sample of Negro youths--in and out of school, male and female--to our questions about associating with whites in fifteen different situations. With a theoretically possible range of average willingness from 0 (completely unwilling), to 4 (completely willing), our respondents' scores actually average about 3.16 for the fifteen activities. There is a tendency to reply in terms of "complete willingness" more than in any other of the four other terms available. Over

---

[1] *Washington Post*, September 11, 1964, p. 22.

TABLE 9

WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE SCORES IN EACH OF FIFTEEN SITUATIONS[a]

		Per Cent of Total Replies				
Situations[b]	Mean Willingness Score	Completely Willing	Somewhat Willing	Unsure	Somewhat Unwilling	Completely Unwilling
School; mostly Negro, few whites	3.70	80	14	3	2	1
White teacher	3.60	77	14	4	2	3
Work side by side with whites	3.58	75	15	5	3	2
Church; mostly Negro, few whites	3.55	76	14	4	1	3
School; half Negro, half white	3.54	73	16	6	2	3
Church; half Negro, half white	3.52	72	17	5	3	3
Club; mostly Negro, few whites	3.50	70	19	5	3	3
Club; half Negro, half white	3.45	69	18	5	5	3
Close friend, white	3.40	65	20	9	2	4
Work under a white person	3.33	60	26	5	5	3
Church, mostly white	2.84	42	26	15	8	8

TABLE 9--Continued

		Per Cent of Total Replies				
Situations[b]	Mean Willingness Score	Completely Willing	Somewhat Willing	Unsure	Somewhat Unwilling	Completely Unwilling
School, mostly white	2.81	40	29	13	8	9
Club, mostly white	2.69	28	37	19	8	8
Dating a white person	2.28	31	21	17	7	23
Marrying a white person	1.67	17	12	27	9	34

[a] This refers to the total sample of 582. There were no more than three cases missing on any item.

[b] One situation which was on the original questionnaire--"being a boss over whites"--does not appear on this table and is ignored in this discussion. It seemed so unlikely a situation that our respondents just laughed when the question was posed, and apparently did not take it seriously; at any rate their answers to this question did not correlate with any others when we worked out the correlation matrix. Thus, for reasons explained in Chapter I, it was deleted from our index.

half (60 per cent) of all responses are 4; the next most frequent response is 3 (somewhat willing), which is made 20 per cent of the time.

Several points should be made at the outset about the meaning of this finding. First, it should be emphasized that our question about associating with whites is framed in terms of mere willingness; therefore, our answers do not measure more positive attitudes such as wanting or demanding.[1]

---

[1] The few studies that have attempted to measure Negroes' feelings of social distance separately from personal hostility or militancy, find no direct relationship between these several kinds of feelings and often an inverse one (Williams, op. cit., p. 281; Gary T. Marx, Protest and Prejudice, to be published October, 1967 by Harper and Row).

Second, it should be remembered that the questionnaire administrator always preceded the attitude schedule with this statement, "Assume that in each case, the whites involved would be completely willing to associate with Negroes." The purpose of this statement was to measure more accurately the current Negro potential for desegregated coexistence by "controlling" for the effect on the Negro of assumed white prejudice. But it appeared that such a control is not possible, even in the laboratory-like situation of an assembled research population. When that part of the directions was read, there was usually laughter. Moreover, many subjects protested in their written comments that it was ridiculous to ask them to imagine that whites would not be prejudiced. On the other hand, there were many frequent written comments to the effect that "I am willing to associate with anyone who is willing to associate with me." There were also unsolicited testimonies to the effect that "I personally have never had any unpleasant dealings with whites."

Finally, therefore it should be stressed that although our study reveals a high degree of Negro acceptance of interracial association,[1] there is no one "Negro attitude toward whites."[2]

---

[1] Similarly, Robin Williams found in four different communities, that "Negroes are less likely to express feelings of social distance or dislike toward whites than whites are to express these feelings concerning Negroes. The differences are statistically significant and large and are consistently found in diverse communities" (Williams, op. cit., p. 300). The Westies in Indianapolis likewise demonstrated that at any status level whites show greater social distance toward Negroes than Negroes do toward whites (Frank R. Westie and Margaret L. Westie, "The Social Distance Pyramid: Relationships between Caste and Class," American Journal of Sociology, LXIII [September, 1957], 192).

[2] Robert B. Johnson describes the broad range of "reactions to minority group status" among adult Negroes in a northeastern industrial city which is one of the communities in Williams' study. At one extreme are the total abstainers from any form of integrated living; at the other are the "white-wardly mobile" (Robert B. Johnson, "Negro Reactions to Minority Group Status," in Milton L. Barron [ed.], American Minorities [New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1957], pp. 204-5).

There are a few conspicuous exceptions to the pattern of general willingness. The percentage of "completely unwilling" responses is dramatically high in the case of marrying and dating, and the willingness index is correspondingly low. Both in the comments on our questionnaires and in the lengthier explanations of our pre-test populations it appears that young Negroes generally reciprocate the traditional white miscegenation taboo. Samples from pre-test interviews document the rejection of intermarriage:

> Many of those interviewed stated that they shunned interracial dating and marriage because "the white man expects it. He [the white man] thinks that to marry or date a white . . . is the primary desire of Negroes."
>
> --Interviewer in Baltimore
> working-to-middle class
> neighborhood

> I belonged to an interracial group, and relationships were very compatible. I attended a predominantly white school throughout with no problems. However, I do not want to leave my own race, socially. I would work with them, go to school with them, but prefere not to marry them. If I do marry them it would be because of the type of person they are.
>
> --Medical Student from
> Washington, D. C.

> I wouldn't marry a white. Society would not leave me alone even if my conscience would.
>
> --Girl College Student,
> Washington, D. C.

> I just couldn't see myself marrying a member of the white race no matter how much I loved him. I would feel more at ease around someone of my own race. I would not be subject to insults; or anything from the white or Negro race then.
>
> --Female Junior at Agriculture
> and Technical College,
> North Carolina

> My subjects preferred intermarriage with upper class whites rather than to whites of other two classes. I felt this is because Negro feels that mixed marriages are not good and therefore if he is going to engage in a mixed marriage there should be something to gain from it.
>
> --Student Interviewer in
> Long Island, New York
> neighborhood

With regard to dating, the taboos are not usually so strong. Still, 23 per cent of our subjects were completely unwilling to date whites and as we shall see, there is a considerable sex differential in this regard. Occasionally however, dating is actually less acceptable than marriage, as in the pre-test case of one New York father who said,

> I would not want any white fellow to go out with my daughter for the thrill of it all. I would not object to a marriage if they love one another. As long as they were serious about one another my wife and I would not impose in any way. I have met a lot of white fellows who have gone out with Negro girls just to have intimate fun.

The indexes are also conspicuously low in the case of membership in predominantly white clubs, schools and churches. They are highest with regard to having some whites in a predominantly Negro school, having white teachers, and working side by side with whites. There are few "unsures" in these situations, and even fewer "completely unwilling."

In what way can these variations in attitude be interpreted? One way is in terms of situational relativism.

From a general social-psychological point of view, situational relativism (or "situational determinism" as it is usually called) decrees that what is proper in one situation may certainly not be proper in another. The social participant, white and black alike, concerned with "fitting in," tailors his behavior in public places to social expectations that Myrdal's "American Dilemma" concept of guilt suffered by American whites whose commitment to the American creed is inconsistent with their convictions of racial supremacy. An empirical check on this contention by the present researcher showed that students in a white university were well able "to live with" the inconsistencies in their several ideologies. They comforted themselves adequately with rationalizations and compartmentalizations.[1]

---

[1] See Sophia Fagin McDowell, "Teaching Note on the Use of the Myrdal Concept of 'An American Dilemma' with Regard to the Race Problem in the United States," Social Forces, XXX (1951), 87-91.

An empirical test of the guilt assumption in a southern city in 1959 finds that the assumption is not supported. The researcher concludes that there is a crucial difference between any single set of ideal norms a person maintains and his behavior which may involve those norms. He stresses the relevance in every situation of possibly conflicting norms, and the relative lack of uneasiness with what the ordinary citizen deals with his own value incongruities.[1]

The data of our own study do not themselves permit an explicit empirical reexamination of the "rank order of discrimination" in particular situations which Myrdal alleged was for Negroes the reverse of what it was for whites, because our instrument does not include the specific items in the Myrdal list. But such a test performed in a Florida city also in 1959 found no significant inverse relationship between white and Negro scales.[2] Not extra-psychical factors, though they may be involved in setting degrees and limits but social structure provides the definition of the situation. Prejudice for the white is often conformity rather than neurosis.[3] When the Negro behaves according to white expectations and voluntarily segregates himself, he may just be doing what in good old-fashioned sociology is called "adjustment."

The arbitrary, unpredictable and changing nature of situational relativism in local race relations is illustrated by a recent news item in an area newspaper, headlined, "Negro Family Welcomed, Then Shunned in Suburb." The article commences:[1]

---

[1] Ernest Q. Campbell, "Moral Discomfort and Racial Segregation--an Examination of the Myrdal Hypothesis," Social Forces, XXXIX (March, 1961), 228-34.

[2] Lewis M. Killian and Charles M. Grigg, "Rank Orders of Discrimination of Negroes and Whites in a Southern City," Social Forces, XXXIX (March, 1961), 235-39.

[3] The distinction between personal controls and social controls in Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz, Social Change and Prejudice (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), pp. 37-48, seems more relevant in this connection.

> They had lived happily in integrated communities in Texas and Missouri, a young Negro couple told a Fairfax Circuit judge yesterday. But, when they tried to join a white neighborhood swimming pool in Northern Virginia, the barriers went up . . . Mr. Theodore R. Freeman, 41, a soft-spoken education specialist with the Agriculture Department who holds a doctorate, said his family was "getting along very well" with their neighbors at their rented home at 6810 Quander Rd. until they were denied use of the pool. When they moved in in February, they were made welcome. Neighbors dropped by to say hello, lent them furniture when their own was delayed, and invited the wife to "little coffees" at their homes. But when it came to swimming in the same pool that Spring, a chill set in . . .

The husband, wife and children then were isolated and avoided by their former friends. The Negro couple had undertaken court proceedings to seek a clear legal definition of the situation. Whatever their outcome, the story emphasizes the importance attached to drawing the line situationally, and that "caste-like taboos in one sphere of life can exist alongside of equalitarianism in other spheres, although the same set of persons is involved."[2]

However, situational relativism in contemporary race relations is complicated by the fact that nobody's definition of the situation remains stable. Thus the five items in Table 9 which are lowest in mean willingness scores for Negroes are also highest in percentage of unsure responses. This suggests that certain situational requirements and intimacy lines may currently be in process of changing and that respondents may not be willing or able to take a clear position with regard to them. The newspaper article quoted above also demonstrates the disequilibrium involved when intimacy line is relocated.

Situational relativism varies not only from time to time, but also from group to group. Public opinion polls can distinguish between "Negro opinion" and "white opinion" regarding interracial issues, although there are varieties within each group, and also a no man's land of "undecideds." Our own data have established differences in acceptance of various situations on the basis of sex and school status to be reported later in this chapter.

---

[1] The Washington Post, April 13, 1967, p. A 1.

[2] Erving Goffman, Behavior in Public Places (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), p. 12.

A deeper question is: what are the fundamental elements of particular activities which may make them situationally acceptable?

One such element is familiarness. It is significant that all the situations which our respondents endorsed highly are ones which they have experienced routinely. The reverse applies to marrying and dating. In race relations, as in all areas of life, from style to religion, an individual comes to define as "fitting" that to which he has become accustomed.

While interracial exposure does not always produce interracial acceptance (Chapter I presented considerable evidence from the pre-test to the contrary), it does do so under certain circumstances of group endorsement and enforcement. In broad historic perspective, we note that when different ethnic groups have come together, whether as a result of wars or commerce or other circumstances, they have usually assimilated unless blocked by man-made barriers, or by stress on visible physical differences.[1] In more recent times, research with white individual subjects shows that it is the person who has the closest interracial contact who is the most likely to welcome further contact.

Stouffer's World War II experiments involving integration of Negro platoons into white infantry companies established this point. When, ex post facto, white servicemen were asked how much they would like or dislike the mixed company arrangement, the percentage of whites preferring the interracial arrangement ranged from high to low in this sequence: (1) infantrymen in a company which had a Negro platoon, (2) infantrymen in other companies in the same regiment, (3) field artillery, anti-tank and HQ units in the same division, and (4) cross section of other field force units which did not have Negro platoons in white companies. In other words, the closer the contact, the greater the acceptance.[1]

---

[1] Park makes a pointed distinction between that usage of the term "assimilation" to mean "to make like" and the usage to "to take up and incorporate." It is the latter sense that applies to processes in secondary groups, while the former relates more to primary groups. Robert E. Park, "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups," Race and Culture (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950), pp. 204-20.

It has also been established empirically in studies with Negro subjects that informal interracial contact and friendship are inversely correlated with social distance.[2] With specific reference to the school situation, recent educational surveys have pointed to this conclusion,

> The inference is strong that Negro high school students prefer biracial education only if they have experienced it before. If a Negro student has not received his formative education in biracial schools, the chances are he will not choose to enter one in his more mature years.[3]

Another criterion by which acceptability or a particular activity can be assessed is its involving "an issue of equal economic and social opportunities." This is one of our original hypotheses, but it was not sustained in our study population. These youths do not reflect the emphasis in the current civil rights movements on equal education and economic opportunities, for the expected high acceptance of interracial association in jobs and schools did not occur consistently. (See the positions of these items in the list ranked by mean willingness score, Table 9.)

---

[1] Samuel A. Stouffer et al., The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life ("Studies in Social Psychology in World War II," Vol. I; Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1949), p. 592. It is relevant to our understanding of the relationship between contact and acceptance which we will discuss more fully in Chapter V, to note that these army experiments in desegregation were all stamped with the approval of the sponsoring institution.

[2] D. L. Noel and A. Pinckney, "Correlates of Prejudice: Some Racial Differences and Similarities," American Journal of Sociology, LXIX (May, 1964), 609-22.

[3] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, p. 110, quoting from U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights, U. S. A. Public Schools Southern States, 1962, pp. 30-31.

Alternatively, the attribute of intimacy has been seen as the crucial one in distinguishing between acceptable or unacceptable activities. Myrdal's "reverse rank order of discrimination" maintains that while what whites fear most is that the Negro may transgress the sex separation taboos, "the Negroes resist least the discrimination placed highest on the white man's list."[1] This does indeed seem to be the case with our sample. If, as in Table 10, we average the mean willingness scores and per cents completely willing to engage in intimate activities (2.83 and 47 per cent respectively) and compare these figures with the means for non-intimate activities (3.42 and 81 per cent respectively) the Myrdal hypothesis seems to be supported.[2] But looking

---

[1] Gunnar Myrdal, American Dilemma (New York: Harper & Row, 1944), p. 61.

[2] In classifying activities as intimate or non-intimate, we decided to exclude churches, whatever their racial composition, because it became evident in the pre-test that there is considerable variation in viewpoint concerning the nature of the church experience. To some the church is like an intimate social club, as Kenneth Clark describes in Dark Ghetto: ". . . The Negro church is a social and recreational club and a haven of comfort for the masses of Negroes. Within the church, a Negro porter or maid can assume responsibilities and authority not available to him elsewhere. Only there can he engage in political intrigue and participate in financial decisions open to whites in many other aspects of their lives. Here the Negro domestic exchanges her uniform for a "high-fashion" dress and enjoys the admiration and envy of other friends. The value of the church providing personal affirmation and self-esteem for Negroes is great enough to permit them to tolerate almost any degree of personal, theological, or educational inadequacy upon the part of their minister, so long as he holds the church together as a successful social and financial institution . . ." (Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power /New York: Harper & Row, 1965/, pp. 174-75). To others it evokes far less feelings as E. Franklin Frazier describes in upper class Negro attendance at Episcopal, Presbyterian and Congregational churches whose services are "ritualistic and deliberative" (see E. Franklin Frazier, The Negro Church in America /New York: Shocken Books, 1964/, p. 52). And this point of view is echoed by a student who says: "What is church really for

TABLE 10

WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE IN INTIMATE AND NON-INTIMATE SITUATIONS BY MEAN WILLINGNESS SCORES AND PER CENT COMPLETELY WILLING[a]

	Intimate Activities			Non-Intimate Activities	
Situation	Mean Willingness Score	% Completely Willing	Situation	Mean Willingness Score	% Completely Willing
Club, mostly Negro	3.50	70	School, mostly Negro; few whites	3.70	80
Club, half Negro; half white	3.45	69	White teacher	3.60	77
Close friend, white	3.40	65	Work side by side with whites	3.58	75
Club, mostly white	2.69	28	School, half Negro; half white	3.54	73
Dating a white person	2.28	31	Work under a white person	3.33	60
Marrying a white person	1.67	17	School, mostly white	2.81	40
Mean	2.83	47	Mean	3.42	81

[a] This refers to the total sample of 582. There were no more than three cases missing on any item.

---

than to pray. It doesn't make any difference who you pray along side just as long as you do . . ." A college freshman who "had nothing against whites" except that "I wouldn't want to marry a white man, I want to marry my own kind," maintained a neutrality with regard to church attendance: "As for religion, I don't care who I go to church with. That's God's house and we all belong." In complete contrast, another student remarked: "Sundays at 11 o'clock should be the most segregated part of one's life." Others express at the individual items which are being added, we note that only three of them, marrying, dating and preponderantly white clubs had low indexes, or low percentages of respondents who were completely willing to engage in that activity with whites. These would account for the low average, for the other three intimate activities were all completely acceptable to at least 65 per cent of the respondents. Therefore, as might be expected, the criterion for willingness to associate is not solely the intimacy of the activity nor its conventional acceptance. The relatively high ranking of predominantly Negro groups (clubs as well as schools and churches) and the low ranking of the very same groups when they are predominantly white, may indicate avoidance of the discomfort inherent in participation as a numerical minority. It would appear that the young Negro may choose to accept interracial association only when he is assured of his own acceptability by the whites involved. Consistent with this thesis is the relatively high "complete willingness" to have a close friend who is white, an intimate association, but one where the racial ratio is perfectly balanced.

Table 11 highlights this factor. The table suggests that the Negro youth is not avoiding association with whites in particular kinds of groups, so much as association under conditions where whites are in a numerical minority. One female academic who grew up in a white neighborhood reports that the whites "treated us as equals. White and Negro got along well." Nevertheless,

---

indifference both to the idea of church attendance and the race composition of the congregation. One pre-test evaluation points up a class pattern in feelings about interracial worship, acceptance rising gradually with class level as has been found generally true for other activities. For instance, a working class interviewer in Florida objected strongly to going to church with whites, "because they don't know how to feel religion."

Exactly how all these interpretations apply to our high school age population is not clear, but these ambiguities in interpretation argue against categorizing church as either an intimate or a non-intimate activity.

TABLE 11

WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE IN THREE GROUPS OF VARYING RACIAL COMPOSITION PER CENT OF COMPLETE WILLINGNESS AND MEAN WILLINGNESS SCORE[a]

Situation	Per cent Completely Willing			Per cent Completely Unwilling			Mean Willingness Score		
	>N	½	>W	>N	½	>W	>N	½	>W
Club	70	69	28	3	3	8	3.50	3.45	2.69
Church	76	72	42	3	3	8	3.55	3.52	2.84
School	80	73	40	1	3	9	3.70	3.54	2.81
Mean Per cent or Score	75	72	37	2	3	8	3.58	3.50	2.78

[a] This refers to the total sample of 582. There were no more than 3 cases missing on any item.

she expresses complete willingness to associate only in those interracial situations where there are mostly Negroes.[1]

In addition to the acceptability by the individual Negro of those situations which already include a majority of Negroes, or at least as many Negroes as whites, there may be the added assumption that such situations provide competitive opportunities for Negro leadership not otherwise available.

---

[1] Although not applicable to our sample, it should be noted in contrast that there are some special opportunities in contemporary society for the lone Negro to gain prestige through his uniqueness in a white situation. The prestige may not be merely due to his special capabilities, but also to the white man's embarrassment at the tardiness of his recognition of these capabilities and the white man's need for conscience balm or for the appearance of liberalism such as in the case of the "front office Negro."

The Sex Differential in Willingness to Associate

Looking at male and female scores separately, we see that the same patterns of acceptance and rejection generally apply to both. While in most

TABLE 12

WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE SCORES ON EACH OF 15 ACTIVITIES, BY SEX[a]

Activity	Mean Score for Each Activity		Percentage Completely Willing	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
School, mostly Negro; few whites	3.58	3.76	74	84
Church, mostly Negro; few whites	3.41	3.71	71	80
Church, half Negro; half white	3.39	3.61	68	76
School, half Negro; half white	3.34	3.67	65	78
Club, mostly Negro; few whites	3.31	3.58	63	74
White Teacher	3.27	3.73	69	82
Close friend, white	3.26	3.47	64	66
Club, half Negro; half white	3.23	3.54	61	73
Work under a white person	3.12	3.47	55	63
Dating a white person	2.71	2.07	45	23
Work side by side with whites	2.66	2.96	67	79
Church, mostly white	2.66	2.96	38	45

TABLE 12--Continued

Activity	Mean Score for Each Activity		Percentage Completely Willing	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
School, mostly white	2.55	2.96	35	44
Club, mostly white	2.49	2.80	26	29
Marrying a white person	1.94	1.53	25	12

[a]This refers to the total sample of 582. There were no more than 3 cases missing on any item.

activities, females are more favorably disposed than males to interracial association, the reverse is true with regard to dating and marriage. Female percentages of complete willingness to either date or marry are only half that of males, and a markedly higher percentage of females than males register complete unwillingness to date whites.

Negro female reluctance for such sexually-significant interracial intimacies as dating and marriage is generally explained historically and sociologically. It also appears to be empirically demonstrated in some other studies. No consensus with regard to a general sex differential in prejudice is possible, however, because the studies referred to vary so radically in dates, places, characteristics of sample population, kind of prejudice being tested and instruments used. For instance, the firmest statement of sex differential comes from the Cornell Studies in Intergroup Relations, which produced a great deal of data from four different Negro communities. After elaborate statistical manipulation of the data, Williams affirms, "Consecutive controls on a variety of relevant variables demonstrates that sex bears a strong and tenacious relation to social distance prejudice in the Negro communities."[1] With age, marital status, education, interracial contact and organization membership all held constant, Negro females are consistently more "prejudiced" than Negro males. However, this finding may well reflect the fact that the particular social distance instrument used is based exclusively on three or four intimate activities.[2] It is specifically with regard to intimate activities of direct sexual relevance that our own sample females are less willing to associate than our males, but with reference to other kinds of activities, the opposite is true. In a more recent study of adult populations, Gary Marx[3] finds slightly more anti-white hostility among women than among men. There seems to be no point in comparing our findings with those of other research concerned with different dimensions of interracial feeling because we know that these different manifestations have the same correlates.[4]

---

[1] Williams, op. cit., p. 269.

[2] The social distance scale used asks, "Do you think you would ever find it a little distasteful:

1. to eat at the same table with a (Ethnic) person?
2. to dance with a (Ethnic) person?
3. to go to a party and find that most of the people are (Ethnics)?
4. to have a (Ethnic) person marry someone in your family" (ibid., p. 412).

A shortcoming of this scale, in addition to the fact that it is limited entirely to intimate activities, most of which have sexual overtones, is that their answers may reflect something quite different from race feeling. For instance, answers to no. 3 may reflect reaction not to whites but to oneself as a conspicuous individual who seems not to belong, because all the others are different. This question may be a test of one's extrovertism, boldness, self-consciousness, etc., not race feeling.

[3] Marx, op. cit.

[4] In reviewing a variety of studies concerning the correlates of different kinds of prejudice, Stember reported that white persons of higher education were less likely to endorse negative stereotypes of Negroes but more likely to seek social distance from Negroes in personal affairs (see Stember, op. cit.).

When we compare the academic and the drop-out subsamples separately, by sex, we find some inconsistencies. Drop-out females are markedly more disposed than drop-out males to associate with whites[1] except in the case of predominantly white clubs, dating and marriage. Among the academic subsamples, male-female differences in most activities are only slight and not consistent, but the sex differential in dating and marriage is identical to the sex differential among drop-outs. While one instance of lesser female willingness--close friend--does relate to the attribute of intimacy, the other two involve the employment situation, which might well reflect greater female timidity, than race antagonism. If so it would not be consistent with the familiar formula that competition leads to prejudice.

Indeed, while one or the other of the customary explanations for sex differential in prejudice may apply in some cases, none seems invariably relevant: e.g., "the double burden of race and sex upon Negro females,"[2] "men, being generally less insulated from society than women,"[3] are less traditional.

From our data we can only conclude that females do tend to respond favorably to some interracial association more readily than males, but not where sexual intimacy may be involved. However, as we shall see in the next section, male/female differences are not half so great as in-school/out-of-school differences.

In-School/Out-of-School Differences

When the same data we have examined before are arranged so as to

---

[1] Some of this marked difference may be due not just to the sexual variable but to the source of our sample. The non-school males happen to represent a more disadvantaged, alienated portion of the population than the out-of-school females. See Chapter I above.

[2] Williams, op. cit., p. 269. [3] Marx, op. cit.

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGES COMPLETELY WILLING TO ASSOCIATE IN DIFFERENT ACTIVITIES BY SEX AND SUBSAMPLE

Activity	Academic			Drop-Out		
	Female (N=221)	Male (N=138)	Difference	Female (N=31)	Male (N=80)	Difference
White Teacher	86	84	+ 2	55	42	+13
Church, mostly Negro; few whites	85	80	+ 5	71	54	+17
School, mostly Negro; few whites	83	79	+ 4	87	64	+23
School, half Negro; half white	81	74	+ 7	72	49	+23
Work side by side with whites	80	81	- 1	61	42	+19
Church, half Negro; half white	78	74	+ 4	61	56	+ 5
Club, half Negro; half white	77	73	+ 4	48	40	+ 8
Club, mostly Negro; few whites	76	73	+ 3	65	47	+18
Close friend, white	69	76	- 7	48	43	+ 5
Work under a white person	64	71	- 7	58	27	+31
Church, mostly white	45	45	0	35	25	+10
School mostly white	45	43	+ 2	29	22	+ 7
Club, mostly white	32	29	+ 3	10	21	-11
Dating a white person	28	51	-23	10	33	-23
Marrying a white person	15	29	-14	6	20	-14
Average	62.9	64.1	5.7	47.7	39.0	15.1

focus on in-school/out-of-school contrasts, our findings are consistent with the results of many other studies which focus on socio-economic correlates of prejudice. (A fuller discussion of socio-economic correlates follows in Chapter IV.)

TABLE 14

PERCENTAGES COMPLETELY WILLING TO ASSOCIATE IN DIFFERENT ACTIVITIES BY SEX AND SUBSAMPLE[a]

Activity	Totals			Males		Females		
	In-School	Drop-Out	Difference between In and out	Academic	Drop-Out	Academic	Vocational	Drop-Out
White Teacher	84	46	38	84	42	86	81	55
School, mostly Negro; few whites	82	71	11	79	64	83	83	87
Work side by side with whites	81	47	34	81	42	80	82	61
Church, mostly Negro; few whites	81	60	21	80	54	85	73	71
Schools, half Negro; half white	77	55	22	74	49	81	75	72
Church, half Negro; half white	76	58	18	74	56	78	73	61
Club, half Negro; half white	75	42	33	73	40	77	73	48
Club, mostly Negro	74	51	23	73	47	76	73	65
Close friend, white	70	46	24	76	43	69	64	48

TABLE 14--Continued

Activity	Totals			Males		Females		
	In-School	Drop-Out	Difference between In and out	Academic	Drop-Out	Academic	Vocational	Drop-Out
Work under a white person	66	36	30	71	27	64	61	58
Church, mostly Negro; few whites	45	29	16	45	25	45	44	35
School, mostly Negro; few whites	44	24	20	43	22	45	43	29
Dating a white person	32	28	4	51	33	28	15	10
Club, mostly Negro; few whites	30	18	12	29	21	32	27	10
Marrying a white person	17	16	1	29	20	15	5	6

[a] This refers to the total sample of 582. There were no more than 3 cases missing on any item.

The drop-out population registers markedly less complete willingness to associate than the in-school population. There is more than 10 per cent points difference between the two sets of scores in the case of every single activity, except marriage and dating, which have consistently low indexes in all groups.

Further, there is a differential within the school populations between the vocational and academic subsamples, with a generally greater willingness to associate on the part of the latter. The one instance where the vocationals (who are all female) report a slightly greater interracial readiness than the academic girls is, understandably, the matter of working side-by-side with whites. This probably signifies the relatively greater work orientation, rather than interracial-orientation of the vocationals. One vocational girl did comment, "I get along better with whites than with Negroes as far as work is concerned." The difference between academic and vocational indexes is rarely more than a few percentage points, except with regard to marriage and dating, where the academics are several times more "completely willing." In general, the vocationals represent an intermediate interracial attitude between the academic students and the drop-outs, a position which may reflect their intermediate class position.

Some in-school people objected to the question of willingness to have a white teacher:

> We don't have much choice. We're assigned to their classes.
>
> No. 13 is a stupid question; most of the students have had white teachers all of their school year.

It might appear that the student was right and it was "stupid" or at least useless to ask whether a person would be completely willing to do what is inevitable. The fact is, however, that less than half the drop-outs registered "complete willingness" to have a white teacher, and some told us that "white teachers are prejudiced."

It is noteworthy that the greatest differential between drop-outs and in-school youth concerns white teachers and white fellow-workers. Unpleasant experiences in these areas are more likely to have occurred to lower class youth, and such experiences may continue to bias their attitudes in young adulthood, or even beyond. Indeed, the recent U. S. Commission on Civil Rights report on Racial Isolation in the Public Schools shows evidence that when recent Negro high school graduates are queried, "Would you be willing to send your child out of the neighborhood to go to an integrated school?" it is those who have had greater experience with desegregation themselves who wish these same experiences for their children.[1]

---

[1] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II, 208, Appendices.

CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC INFLUENCES ON WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE

In this chapter we examine the effect on the willingness index of three socio-economic variables: parental occupation, parental education and respondent's own occupational choice.[1]

Our research design called for the selection of a study population to include some representation from both sexes and from every socio-economic segment of the District of Columbia population. The four senior high schools and two vocational schools themselves cover a broad socio-economic spectrum; the out-of-school category represents the lowest end of the class range. The fact that, we found a considerable distinction between the in-school and out-of-school population in their degree of willingness to associate justifies the selection of the two distinct sub-groups and leads us to explore further into the socio-economic facets of interracial attitudes.

That class influences prejudice is a familiar sociological assumption. As a hypothesis it has been supported by many studies, including several which have dealt specifically with Negro prejudice toward whites.[2]

---

[1] In a pre-test, information on family income also was requested. The information offered proved to be highly inadequate--many pre-test respondents failed to reply to such questions, and several siblings who did reply gave grossly discrepant answers. So we gave up both that specific question and the attempt to develop a 3-item class index based on family income, parental occupation, and parental education.

[2] Some correlation between the socio-economic status of the Negro subject and the degree of his prejudice toward whites has been explored in each of the following studies: T. C. Cothran, "Negro Concepts of White People," American Journal of Sociology, LVI (March, 1961), 458-67; J. B.

2

While these studies are not agreed on the class correlates of prejudice, the inconsistencies in their results may be accounted for at least in part, by their lack of agreement on a common dimension and index of prejudice. Nor do these studies share the same conceptual or operational definition of class; in fact, one of the problems in generalizing about empirical findings in sociology with regard to class, is that neither a standardized concept nor measure exists. Even if consensus on these scores were achieved, community variations in class patterns would complicate the usage of the class term.

This is particularly true when we are dealing with a Negro population in the United States. Here the problems of class confronting all sociological studies are further compounded by the peculiar "color-caste system" in the south and the "ethnic-class system" in the north.[1] Moreover, the Negro's class status in the Negro community may have little relevance to his status in the white community. This already-ambiguous reference group situation is still further complicated by important recent socio-economic changes involving race (see Chapter III).

Edlefsen, "Social Distance Attitudes of Negro College Students," Phylon, XVII (First Quarter, 1956), 79-83; P. A. McDaniel and Nicholas Babchuk, "Negro Conceptions of White People in a Northeastern City," Phylon, XXI (Spring, 1960), 7-19; Noel and Pinkney, loc. cit., pp. 609-22; E. T. Prothro and J. A. Jensen, "Comparison of Some Ethnic and Religious Attitudes of Negro and White College Students in the Deep South," Social Forces, XXX (1952), 426-28; G. A. Steckler, "Authoritarian Ideology in Negro College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LIV (1957), 396-99; Frank R. Westie and David H. Howard, "Social Status Differentials and the Race Attitudes of Negroes," American Sociological Review, XIX (October, 1954), 584-91; Westie and Westie, "The Social Distance Pyramid," loc. cit.

[1] St. Clair Drake, "The Social and Economic Status of the Negro in the United States," Daedalus, XCIV (Fall, 1965), 781-84.

All these factors undoubtedly combine in different ways to affect interracial attitudes. It has not been possible thus far to assess all the variables involved nor to control for them individually. In the present research anticipated that while the usual socio-economic variables such as parental occupation and parental education would have some influence on interracial attitudes of Negro youth, the youths' own mobility expectations would be relatively more influential. Table 15 shows the general distribution of our population by sex and school status subgroups with regard to three socio-economic variables. Table 16 examines the relationship between these variables and willingness to associate.

TABLE 15

PER CENT OF MEMBERS OF EACH SUBGROUP CROSS-CLASSIFIED BY INDEPENDENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES

Subgroup	Socio-economic Variable									
	Parental Occupation				Parental Education			Own Occupational Choice		
	Business & professional	Clerics, sales	Skilled, semi-skilled	Domestic laborer	Less than high school	High school	More than high school	Lower	Same	Higher
Male academics	31.7	20.8	31.7	15.8	34.1	31.7	34.1	5.6	40.7	53.7
Male drop-out	9.8	11.5	44.3	34.4	47.4	42.1	10.5	10.4	39.6	50.0
Female academics	18.1	21.8	28.5	31.6	33.7	45.1	21.2	4.3	24.5	71.3
Female vocational	8.8	14.7	32.4	44.1	52.1	37.2	10.6	5.1	13.3	81.6
Female drop-out	4.0	12.0	36.0	48.0	73.7	10.5	15.8	4.2	25.0	70.8

Table 16 shows no consistent pattern of relationship between the level

TABLE 16

PER CENT OF MEMBERS OF EACH SUBGROUP IN DESIGNATED LEVELS OF WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE CROSS-CLASSIFIED BY INDEPENDENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES

Levels of willingness by subgroups	Parental Occupation				
	Total[a]	Business & professional	Clerics, sales	Skilled & semi-skilled	Domestic, laborer
Male academics	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
high	55.0	57.9	48.0	52.6	63.2
medium	38.3	39.5	44.0	34.2	36.8
low	6.7	2.6	8.0	13.2	0.0
Male drop-outs	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
high	14.8	0.0	14.3	22.2	9.5
medium	47.5	83.3	57.1	44.4	38.1
low	37.7	16.7	28.6	33.3	52.4
Female academics	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
high	50.3	54.3	59.5	40.0	50.8
medium	44.0	40.0	38.1	52.7	42.6
low	5.7	5.7	2.4	7.3	6.6
Female vocationals	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
high	36.3	44.4	26.7	36.4	37.8
medium	52.9	33.3	66.7	63.6	44.4
low	10.8	22.2	6.7	0.0	17.8
Female drop-outs	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
high	20.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	33.3
medium	56.0	0.0	66.7	55.6	58.3
low	24.0	100.0	33.3	33.3	8.3

TABLE 16--Continued

Parental Education				Own Occupational Choice			
Total[a]	Less than high school	High school	More than high school	Total[a]	Lower	Same	Higher
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
53.2	51.2	52.5	55.8	57.4	66.7	59.1	55.2
38.1	34.9	42.5	37.2	38.9	33.3	38.6	39.7
8.7	14.0	5.0	7.0	3.7	0.0	2.3	5.2
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
15.8	18.5	12.5	16.7	14.6	20.0	15.8	12.5
49.1	48.1	58.3	16.7	45.8	60.0	36.8	50.0
35.1	33.3	29.2	66.7	39.6	20.0	47.4	37.5
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
51.1	43.5	50.6	64.1	51.6	50.0	52.2	51.5
42.9	50.0	41.0	35.9	42.0	50.0	37.0	43.3
6.0	6.5	8.6	0.0	6.4	0.0	10.9	5.2
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
36.2	28.6	42.9	50.0	36.7	40.0	38.5	36.2
52.1	59.2	42.9	50.0	52.0	40.0	46.2	53.7
11.7	12.2	14.3	0.0	11.2	20.0	15.4	10.0
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
21.1	28.6	0.0	0.0	20.8	0.0	0.0	29.4
63.2	50.0	100.0	100.0	54.2	0.0	66.7	52.9
15.8	21.4	0.0	0.0	25.0	100.0	33.3	17.6

[a] Three levels of willingness are designated on this basis: high = mean index, 3.5 or above; medium = mean index, 2.5 - 3.4; low = mean index, 2.4 or less.

of willingness and any one of these variables for any of the subgroups, classified by sex and school status. Each of the three socio-economic variables will be discussed in detail in the appropriate section to follow.

Parental Occupation Variable

With occupation as the first of the socio-economic variables, we divide our respondents, in-school separately from out-of-school, on the basis of parental occupation. Specifically we select father's occupation, though with some reservations, since we are aware of the possibly greater relevance of mother's occupation in a good portion of Negro families. When the father's occupation is not given, or the father is not in the home, mother's occupation is used instead. Each occupation is classified in one of four commonly used categories, as shown in Table 17. It is clear in Table 17 that the in-school/out-of-school differential is more marked and consistent than that of parent's occupational categories. The mean index for all the out-of-school respondents

TABLE 17

MEAN INDEX OF WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE FOR
IN-SCHOOL AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL RESPONDENTS
BY PARENTAL OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES[a]

Parental Occupational Categories	In-School Respondents		Out-of-School Respondents	
	Number	Mean Index	Number	Mean Index
I Professional and Managerial	82	3.39	6	2.87
II Clerical and Sales	84	3.43	10	2.77
III Skilled and Semi-skilled	27	3.24	34	2.73
IV Domestic and Laborer	126	3.28	31	2.69

[a] N = 400: Occupational data necessary for this table were not available for 182 persons.

is 2.77 contrasted with 3.34 for the in-school respondents without regard to parental occupation. There is a similar differential in each parental occupational group. However, the in-school range is very slight (3.24 to 3.43) and so is the drop-out range (2.69 to 2.87) when each of these school status groups are broken down by parental occupation.

Nor does a clear occupational pattern emerge when we cross-classify the parental occupational groups within each of the five subsamples--by sex and academic status--on the basis of their level of willingness. (See Table 16, pages 53-54.) For instance, among the male academics the highest percentage of high willingness is actually among the lowest occupational category: the laboers and domestic workers. Among the male drop-outs it is greatest among the skilled and semi-skilled. Among the female academics, it is the clerical and sales people who are highest. Among the female vocational, it is the business and professional category; and among the female drop-outs (though their numbers are too inadequate to merit confidence) it is the domestic and laborer category.

Other studies which have examined Negroes' interracial social distance feelings in similar terms, generally find Negroes of lower occupational levels to be least favorable toward association with whites.[1] However, they produce contradictory results with regard to persons of middle and high occupational status. For example, in the two communities in the Cornell Studies in Intergroup Relations for which occupational data were available--one in the South, the other in the West--Williams found a curvilinear relationship between prejudice and occupation.[1] The Westies, in Indianapolis, found that social distance feelings conformed to a pyramidal model, the higher occupations having least, the lowest occupations having most, and the middle occupations an intermediate degree of such feeling.[2] Since in these various studies neither the indices of occupational level nor of social distance have been standardized, it is difficult to make comparisons between them or with our own study.

---

[1] For a review of findings of other studies concerned specifically with the occupational variable and Negroes' attitudes toward whites, see Williams, op. cit., "The Worlds of Minorities," chapter viii, pp. 259-64.

An additional element of non-comparability between the data of other studies and our own is that while the correlations they report are between their subjects' own occupation and education, ours are concerned with the subjects' parents.

Since the findings thus far reported were based on a mean willingness index which conceivably could be masking a variety of situational differences in reactions to whites, we sought some way of relating the occupation variable separately to each of the 15 individual situations. For this purpose a gamma coefficient[3] was calculated between each activity as a dependent variable and parental occupation, as an independent variable. The usual four occupational categories were used for each of the subgroups, although the female drop-outs with a total of only 25 answers to divide into 20 possible cells were too small a group to count. (See Table 18.)

---

[1] In this case occupation is classified in three categories: as high status (professionals, proprietors and managers), middle status (white collar, skilled and semi-skilled) and low status (laborers and domestic); social distance prejudice is classified as "high" when the respondent finds one or more of the social distance items--eating, dancing and marrying--"distasteful." Ibid., p. 262.

[2] Westie and Westie, "The Social Distance Pyramid," loc. cit.

[3] The gamma coefficient as developed by Goodman and Kruskal (Leo A. Goodman and William K. Kruskal, "Measures of Association for Cross Classifications," Journal of the American Statistical Association, XLIX /September, 1954/, 732-69) was selected because it seems most appropriate to the data being examined. It provides a measure of the strength of the association between two sets of variables which is not dependent upon any assumption of underlying continuums in the sets of variables; nor is it disturbed by the fact that the number of categories in the respective sets varies considerably.

Concentrating only on those gamma coefficients which exceed ± .25, we see that strong relationships between parental occupation and willingness to associate are few and scattered.[1] We are unable to account for the high correlation (.426) among male drop-outs between their parental occupation and willingness to associate in a church of mixed racial composition unless this is relevant to the role of the church as the prime institution for emphasizing brotherly love. Similarly difficult to account for is the strong gamma coefficient for predominantly Negro school situations on the part of all subgroups except the female academics. Indeed there is no obvious explanation for those items for which a strong relationship was found, and the significance level is not sufficient to cause us to search more deeply.

All in all, the only conclusion warranted from this table is that parental occupation is not of sufficient importance in itself to affect willingness in any specific activity strongly and consistently.

---

[1] The individual contingency tables prepared by the Data Text computer which show the degree of willingness for each separate situational variable as related to the four categories of parental occupation suggest that the way in which the occupations are ordered in this table and in the most common usage, is not an ordered array with respect to these data. For instance, among female academics occupational category 2 (clerical and sales) is certainly the one associated with the highest willingness percentages--higher than either category 1 (business, proprietor, and professional) which precedes it, or category 3 (skilled and unskilled) which follows it. As mentioned earlier, it has been alleged by some researchers that middle class Negroes are more favorably inclined toward whites than either upper or lower class Negroes. There is some indication in these data that this may be the case with regard to particular subgroups, as in the case of the female academics referred to above, or with regard to particular activities in the several subgroups. For example, willingness to work under whites is greatest for the children of category 2 parents without regard to the subjects' academic status or sex. However this is not true with regard to other activities; nor does any other patterned relationship between willingness and parental occupation prevail consistently for all subgroups.

TABLE 18

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL OCCUPATION AND WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE INDEX AS MEASURED BY GAMMA COEFFICIENT BY SEX AND SCHOOL STATUS

Situation	Males		Females	
	Academic (120)	Drop-Out (61)	Academic (193)	Vocational (102)
Club, mostly white	.004	.165	.048	.139
Club, mostly Negro; few whites	.184	.047	.029	.160
Club, half Negro; half white	.241	.106	.159	.017
Marrying a white person	-.041	.094	-.024	.014
Work under a white person	.204	.053	.140	.114
Work side by side with whites	-.129	.087	.119	.210
Church, mostly white	.015	.184	.082	-.007
Church, half Negro; half white	.099	.426	.147	.148
Church, mostly Negro; few whites	.195	.291	.011	.079
Dating a white person	-.148	.240	.111	-.040
Close friend, white	-.086	.086	.099	.170
White teacher	-.046	.140	.136	-.121
School, mostly white	.153	.106	.070	.075
School, half Negro; half white	.280	.247	.039	.217
School, mostly Negro; few whites	.312	.386	.054	.271
Mean	-.002	.259	-.086	.031

[a] On the basis of the chi square test, this statistic is significant at the confidence level of at least .05.

Parental Education Variable

The relationship of parental education to the willingness index is also inconsistent and inconclusive. When these variables are tabulated by in-school/out-of-school subgroups, it is of course the in-school/out-of-school factor which is again prepotent.

TABLE 19

MEAN INDEX OF WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE FOR IN-SCHOOL AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL RESPONDENTS BY PARENTAL EDUCATION CATEGORIES

Parental Education Categories[a]	In-School Respondents		Out-of-School Respondents	
	Number	Mean Index	Number	Mean Index
I <4 yrs. high-school	159	3.21	43	2.74
II 4 yrs. high-school	159	3.30	26	2.77
III >4 yrs. high-school	93	3.46	9	2.60

[a] "Parental" education is defined wherever possible as father's education. N = 489. Educational data necessary for this table were not available for 93 persons. In addition to its incompleteness, another shortcoming of the data on parental education is its possible unreliability. When a comparison was made of between 12th graders' questionnaire answers and their school records about 85 per cent agreement was found on parental education items. See Table 9.6.5, p. 568, Equality of Educational Opportunity, by James S. Coleman *et al.*, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

In the in-school group there is a slight, though consistent, increase in the mean willingness index as parental education increases.[1] However, in the out-of-school subgroup, those whose parents have had some college actually show a lower index than those whose parents are less educated. If this inverse relationship were statistically significant, we would hasten to explain it on the basis of the greater frustration experienced by the drop-out who comes from a higher status family. In Table 16 also the drop-outs fail to show the same direct relationship between parental education and willingness that is found in the high school groups. It seems entirely possible that the interracial attitude of those who are already experiencing failure (i.e., the drop-outs from educationally and occupationally successful families) may be not only different but opposite from those who think they can succeed by the rules of the game, that is the rules of the dominant group society (i.e., our high school seniors). It suggests further a relationship between downward mobility and ethnic avoidance among Negroes which is similar to what has been found among whites,[1] and which we will deal with more directly in the next section which concerns the subject's own occupational choice.

---

[1] This contrasts with the conclusions Stember arrived at after reviewing many studies concerning the relationship between education and prejudice among whites. The studies seemed to show that while the better educated are

To test the possibility that willingness to associate might be more directly related to the individual situation in which association was contemplated, we again computed gamma coefficients between the fifteen individual situations in our index and the independent variable--education. As in the case of gamma coefficients involving occupation, the strong relationships were few and scattered. Among high school girls, the relationship between parental education and dating can be noted, and a conjecture of greater

---

less likely to endorse anti-white stereotypes, they are more likely to have strong social distance reactions toward intimate relations with members of minority groups (Stember, op. cit.). Again, however, comparisons with our data are not appropriate for all the reasons mentioned earlier including the fact that we are dealing not with the respondent's own education, but his parent's.

[1] Bettelheim and Janowitz, op. cit.

TABLE 20

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL EDUCATION AND WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE INDEX AS MEASURED BY GAMMA COEFFICIENT BY SEX AND SCHOOL STATUS

	Males		Females	
Situation	Academic (126)	Drop-Out (57)	Academic (184)	Vocational (94)
Club, mostly white	-.048	-.197	.066	.106
Club, mostly Negro; few whites	-.049	-.130	.005	.215
Club, half Negro; half white	.095	.011	.125	.128
Marrying a white person	.085	-.119	.120	.325
Work under a white person	.024	-.052	.143	.133
Work side by side with whites	.160	-.079	.289	.087
Church, mostly white	.148	.164	.205	.034
Church, half Negro; half white	.247	-.021	.032	-.064
Church, mostly Negro; few whites	.058	.068	.187	.287
Dating a white person	-.054	-.076	.255	.335
Close friend, white	-.013	-.292	.149	.334
White teacher	.074	.010	.302	.015
School, mostly white	.173	-.147	.250	.078
School, half Negro; half white	.206	-.184	.201	.301
School, mostly Negro; few whites	.161	-.028	.089	.222
Mean	.090	-.156	.230	.248

[a] On the basis of the chi square test, this statistic is significant at the confidence level of at least .05.

sophistication can be made. But there is not enough consistency in the data to support this conjecture. It is of special interest that although most of the gamma coefficients are not large enough to demonstrate a strong relationship between parental education and willingness, they are negative figures in 11 out of 15 items with respect to drop-out males. Again, we have, though not at all clearly, the possibility mentioned earlier that the drop-out from a family with higher expectations responds with a special avoidance of whites.

However, our data for all our population subgroups do not support the proposition generally found in studies concerning minority group prejudice[1] as well as dominant group prejudice[2] that an inverse relationship exists between education and social distance feelings, either generalized social distance or such feelings with regard to specific activities or kinds of situations.

Occupation Mobility Aspiration Variable

Some sociologists have found downward occupational mobility to be more important than either occupation or education in the dynamics of dominant group prejudice. This is the thesis of the well-known study of ethnic prejudice of World War II veterans, Dynamics of Prejudice[3] and its follow-up, Social Change and Prejudice.[4] It has been well-supported by empirical evidence; its explanation is that the frustrations engendered by downward mobility can be projected in the form of prejudice onto a conventionally acceptable scapegoat, the Negro or the Jew.

---

[1] Williams, op. cit., pp. 259-60. [2] Stember, op. cit.

[3] Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz, Dynamics of Prejudice (New York: Harper and Bros., 1950).

[4] Bettelheim and Janowitz, Social Change and Prejudice.

Downward mobility may prove especially disgruntling for anyone at all in our kind of society which has an ethic emphasizing upward mobility. Some of our data just discussed about drop-outs from families of higher educational and occupational attainment imply just that. Still a simple parallel of this dynamic could not be expected among Negroes. Most downwardly mobile Negroes are not so free to dispose of their resentment in the same syndrome of interracial projection as whites. Although in his own in-group the Negro may stereotype and ridicule persons of higher social (caste) status, he himself is not sufficiently powerful individually to scapegoat "Mr. Charlie." But collectively, it may be another matter. The disciplined non-violent sit-in movements, the Black Power or Black Nationalist ideologies and the spontaneous combustions of several long, hot summers, may provide an outlet for the long suppressed and repressed resentments.

We are sorry that none of this exceedingly significant collective behavior is within the research framework of our study, or of most of the other prejudice studies to which we have referred in other parts of this chapter. Our study is restricted to individual reactions in the limited range from complete willingness to complete unwillingness to associate with whites. As discussed in another context (Chapter II) such a willingness measure does not purport to be a valid measure of resentment, hostility, militancy, or even desire. Moreover, willingness to associate interracially may be so mixed an attitude, compounded of varying degrees of resignation, self-assertion, expediency, and many other feelings that the resentment component is undistinguishable in the amalgam.

If in this minority group context there is any relevance of the Bettelheim-Janowitz mobility-resentment syndrome, we may speculate that it may actually be a relevance-in-reverse. Individually, the upwardly mobile Negro is more likely to suffer status confusions and frustrations in his contacts with whites. Not having been socialized to his new class position, he experiences strains of mobility similar to what Durkheim described as the crisis of "abrupt growth of power and wealth."[1] Unlike the upwardly mobile white, his disequilibrium is not merely personal but social, not merely a matter of his own re-socialization to an unfamiliar set of class norms but partly of innovating a set of norms where there were none before. Negro status pioneers in the upper strata of the class system, threatened by anomic discomfort, are not so likely to release their tensions through anti-white prejudice. Instead of hate, they choose to imitate. Since racial barriers still limit interpersonal relations and cultural assimilation, their imitations tend, as Frazier observes, to occur in a "make-believe world," the voluntary Negro gilded ghettos of the Black Bourgeoisie.[2] These imitations of a society to which they are denied access are what distressed Hare in his commentary on the "Black Anglo-Saxons."[3] The interracial attitudes of the economically successful Negro may contain so many ambivalences as to be unpredictable, for he experiences acutely the marginal man status Simpson and Yinger find in the racial hybrid: "The minority-group member who feels torn between his association with the group in which he is categorically placed by prejudice and his feelings of identification with the dominant society may well lack some of the security that comes from stable and acceptable group relationships."[4]

Another element in the mobility-prejudice syndrome stressed in the sociological literature is competition. It has been highlighted recently in a model different from that of Bettelheim-Janowitz, and set forth by Hodge and Treiman.[1] The thesis is that the white person who is threatened by Negro competition has an additional incentive for anti-Negro prejudice.

---

[1] Emile Durkheim, Suicide, trans. John A. Spaulding and George Simpson (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951), p. 252.

[2] E. Franklin Frazier, Black Bourgeoisie (New York: Collier, 1962).

[3] Nathan Hare, The Black Anglo-Saxons (New York: Marzani and Munsell, 1965).

[4] George E. Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, Racial and Cultural Minorities (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 207.

However, this competition factor is another one which cannot be applied similarly to Negro prejudice toward whites, for the position of the competitive Negro is different from that of the competitive white. The latter is offensive, the former defensive; from such opposite angles, parallel attitude patterns can hardly be expected to emerge.

Thus existing mobility-prejudice theory does not seem so relevant to minority group prejudice toward whites.

In our study we do have some mobility data. Our basic instrument includes the question, "If you were able to go into any kind of work you wanted to, what occupation would you choose?" Each answer was coded with reference to the respondent's parents' occupational level,[2] and the respondent was then classified as having no mobility, downward mobility or upward mobility. Then, separately for the in-and out-of-school respondents in each category an average willingness index was computed and tabulated as follows:

---

[1] Robert W. Hodge and Donald J. Treiman, "Occupational Mobility and Attitudes Toward Negroes," American Sociological Review, XXXI (February, 1966), 93-102.

[2] For this purpose the occupational scoring used was from the U. S. Bureau of the Census, Methodology and Scores of Socio-economic Status (Working Paper No. 15; Washington: U. S. Department of Commerce, 1963). The score for the occupations chosen by the respondent was compared with the average occupation score for both parents, when this information was available. It was then identified as on the same level, lower level or higher level than parents.

TABLE 21

MEAN INDEX OF WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE FOR IN-SCHOOL AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL RESPONDENTS BY MOBILITY AMBITIONS[a]

Mobility Ambitions	In-School Respondents		Out-of-School Respondents	
	Number	Mean Index	Number	Mean Index
None	104	3.38	25	2.65
Down	19	3.37	6	2.81
Up	274	3.31	41	2.79

[a] N = 469. Data necessary for this table were not available for 113 respondents.

The figures in Table 21 are not sufficiently consistent to support either our own speculation concerning the greater resentment of the upwardly mobile Negro, nor the original hypothesis in the literature of the greater resentment of the downwardly mobile individual.

When gamma coefficients are computed for the individual activities and occupational mobility ambition, there does seem to be a meaningful connection in several instances but the type of situation follows no clearly meaningful pattern (Table 22). For example, among both male academics and male drop-outs, those who have higher mobility do show lower willingness in a number of situations. Three out of 5 of the strongly correlated items for male academics are half and half situations, and they are inversely correlated. (Can it be that upwardly mobile Negro males may not want to compete in a situation of numerically equal chances with whites?) The upwardly mobile male drop-outs do not want to go with whites to churches of any racial composition. Among female academics there is an unaccountable

TABLE 22

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENTS' OWN OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY AMBITION AND HIS WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE INDEX AS MEASURED BY GAMMA COEFFICIENT BY SEX AND SCHOOL STATUS[a]

Situation	Males		Females	
	Academic (108)	Drop-Out (48)	Academic (188)	Vocational (98)
Club, mostly white	-.123	-.023	-.012	-.086
Club, mostly Negro; few whites	-.077	-.236	.291	.196
Club, half Negro; half white	-.521	-.048	.122	.017
Marrying a white person	.050	.063	-.129	-.352
Work under a white person	-.060	.062	.029	.162
Work side by side with whites	.128	-.055	.252	.022
Church, mostly white	-.133	-.281	-.007	.027
Church, half Negro; half white	-.468	-.508	-.033	-.181
Church, mostly Negro; few whites	-.228	-.412	.255	-.026
Dating a white person	.047	-.088	-.123	-.024
Close friend, white	-.136	.016	.095	-.251
White teacher	-.414	.200	.269	.238
School, mostly white	-.052	.006	.008	-.220
School, half Negro; half white	-.395	-.202	.235	.088
School, mostly Negro; few whites	-.341	-.145	-.074	.311
Mean	.121	.043	-.025	-.031

[a] On the basis of the chi square test, this statistic is significant at the confidence level of at least .05.

scattering of positive coefficients. Some strong inverse correlations occur again among vocationals indicating that the upwardly mobile are least willing to date and marry whites.

Referring to the overall Table 17 at the beginning of this chapter, we note that those with higher mobility have a lower level of willingness among male academics, male drop-outs, and female vocationals; this is partially true with regard to female academics, but the reverse seems to be the case in our very small sample of female drop-outs.

Obviously neither our research design nor the numbers and nature of our population are satisfactory for testing the mobility hypotheses. But both our data and our deductions raise the possibility of a relationship that is opposite to that of whites. Actually, the psychological complications of the Negro mobility situation are so numerous and so counterbalancing that realistically mobility aspirations cannot be analyzed independently, but must be analyzed as part of a multi-factoral situation.

CHAPTER V

THE SCHOOL EXPERIENCE VARIABLE

Introduction

The psychological importance of school desegregation in terms of the damage to the Negro child's self-concept was officially acknowledged in the Supreme Court decision of 1954: Mr. Chief Justice Warren, delivering the opinion for the court, quoted from the finding of the lower court

> . . . segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. The impact is greater when it has the sanction of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group. A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to [retard] the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefit they should receive in a racial[ly] integrated school system.[1]

The effect of school segregation on the Negro child's conceptions of whites and on interracial relationships was not stressed then nor has it been fully explored since. Therefore, it is of special interest that a 1967 report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights declares, "Racial isolation in the school also fosters attitudes and behavior that perpetuate isolation in other important areas of American life. Negro adults who attended racially isolated schools are more likely to have developed attitudes that alienate them from whites."[2]

It was often assumed in the early days following the Supreme Court dictum that, given the opportunity for association in the schools, the young would emerge with a felicitous acceptance of each other, unimpeded by racial barriers or dilemmas. This proved to be gross oversimplification. Numerous complications developed in implementing the desegregation decision. With urban development, redevelopment, residential restrictions, etc., de facto segregation separated the races as effectively as de jure segregation had done in the past. Concern with the Equality of Educational Opportunity, as one 1966 Office of Education publication[1] was titled, engrossed researchers in the measurement of academic achievement and its relation to curriculum and to such personnel factors as student-teacher ratios, teacher qualifications and such material things as school facilities, laboratories, gymnasiums and cafeterias. New technical and political issues in achieving desegregation followed, overlapped and replaced the old simpler issue of legally outlawing school segregation; integration became recognized as considerably more complicated than the congregating of Negro and white bodies side by side in the same physical space.

---

[1] Brown et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kan. et al. 347 U. S. 483 (1954).

[2] Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, I, 110.

Originally, relevant sociological theory had maintained that interracial propinquity and communication "on a person-to-person basis" would dissolve stereotypes and other prejudices.[2] Interestingly, this theoretical model for interracial amity resembles the model which prevailed in the early days of confrontation between conflicting labor and management forces. Accommodating forces in the American labor movement and their counterpart in capital contended that if only both sides to a labor dispute could be induced to meet face to face to talk around the same table, peace could be attained.[1] The fact that this was a gemeinschaft-like over-simplification is evidenced by the necessity for subsequent legal codification of these very relationships in the National Labor Relations Act. Here in more realistic terms, the "inequality of bargaining power" between labor and capital was recognized.

---

[1] Coleman et al., op. cit.

[2] A recent intergroup relations textbook restates this principle: "The more one meets members of other ethnic categories, the more exceptions he finds. In fact the better one gets to know anyone, the more he is seen as a distinct personality that does not fit into any social type." Tamatsu Shibutani and Kian M. Kwan, Ethnic Stratification, A Comparative Approach (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965), p. 110.

When it became clear in interracial relations (as paralleled in labor relations) that propinquity and discussion are not the universal solvents for group antagonisms, certain refinements developed in race relations theory. It became recognized that the parties who had heretofore regarded each other antagonistically must achieve not merely physical proximity and formal communication but that their contact must be at an equal status level.[2] (Of course assimilation is not the only possible outcome of racial antagonisms. As Frazier particularly pointed out Negroes have often become just "wards" of the whites, or nationalistic movements have developed. The frame of reference and value orientation of this study, however, is the striving for democratic integration, particularly within the schools.)

The findings reported in this chapter point to yet another requirement for de facto integration. This requirement is the voluntary, informal contact between Negro and white fellow-students beyond the institutional requisites within the physical confines of the institution. Without these voluntary, informal dealings the formal, in-school contacts are a ritual, a temporary fiction in which both Negro and white participants concur, until they depart the confines of the school building for the "real life" outside.

---

[1] U. S. Code Annotated, Title 29, Labor (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1965), p. 174, Section 151.

[2] Gordon Allport and B. M. Kramer, "Some Roots of Prejudice," Journal of Social Psychology, XXII (July, 1946), 17-18

This point was not made specifically in two important empirical studies, both in summer camps with large populations and good controls, which focussed on the effect of equal status contacts upon prejudice. Their lesson is that it is not the intimate relationships alone that account for the degree and direction of attitude change, but the social climate of the camps, the concern on the part of camp leadership, and the varying *personality make-ups* of the boys involved.[1] Nor is it specifically demonstrated in Sherif's well-known experiments[2] which show that conflicting groups do not reconcile completely until it becomes for them to work together to achieve a common good which cannot be accomplished without joint participation.

This requirement of voluntary informal contact is not listed explicitly in Pettigrew's summary of prerequisites for successful desegregation, which include that both groups "(1) possess approximately equal status, (2) seek common goals, (3) are cooperatively dependent upon one another, and (4) interact, with the positive support of authorities, law or custom."[3] However, it is succinctly stated in this year's Commission on Civil Rights' report: "School desegregation has its greatest impact upon student attitudes and preferences through the mediating influence of friendship with students of the other race."[4] It is one of the unequivocal findings of our own data analysis.

---

[1] Paul H. Mussen, "Some Personality and Social Factors, Related to Changes in Children's Attitudes Toward Negroes," *Journal of Abnormal and and Social Psychology*, XLV (July, 1950), 423-41; and Marian Radke Yarrow, "Interpersonal Dynamics in a Desegregation Process," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. XIV (1958) "special issue."

[2] M. Sherif, O. J. Harvey, B. J. White, W. R. Hood, and Carolyn Sherif, *Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiment* (Norman, Okla.: Institute of Group Relations, 1961). See also, M. Sherif, "Superordinate Goals in Reduction of Intergroup Conflict," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXIII (January, 1958), 349-56.

[3] Thomas F. Pettigrew, *A Profile of the Negro American* (Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1964), p. 168.

[4] *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, I, 111.

School Desegregation Experience

The first school experience variable we explore is the level of formal school desegregation and its relation to the willingness index. Washington, D. C. high school Negro youth have not had extensive desegregation experience. Less than one-third of them have ever been in a predominantly white school or in one with an equal race ratio. There were only 30 white students in our senior class samples which included 47 Negro students from four academic high schools and two vocational high schools.

The proportion of in-school respondents who reported that "most" or "all" of their fellow students were Negro in the third, sixth, ninth and twelfth grades were 73 per cent, 86 per cent, 90 per cent and 99 per cent respectively, indicating that de facto desegregation is greater in Washington, D. C. now than in the past.

It is hardly to be expected, with such attenuation of desegregation variance, that the degree of desegregation would be a strong predictor of interracial attitude. Thus, when we classify our students in three groups on the basis of the degree of desegregation experiences, we find only slight evidence of a positive influence of this variable on their willingness index.

When the in-school sample is observed separately from the out-of-school sample in terms of their desegregation experiences, the drop-outs are considerably less willing to associate with whites--10 per cent less willing in the case of the totally segregated people and 15 per cent less willing in the case of the least segregated. In both sex subsamples and school status subsamples those with a "little" desegregation always show greater willingness to associate than those with none at all; still there is not always an added increment of willingness for those with "most" desegregation.

Relatively great experience in desegregated school sometimes, but not always, is accompanied by greater willingness to associate with whites in particular activities. This is shown by the gamma coefficients computed

TABLE 23

MEAN INDEX OF WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE CLASSIFIED
BY EXTENT OF DESEGREGATION AND
SEX AND SCHOOL STATUS

Subsample	Extent of Desegregation[a]		
	None (121)	Little (275)	Most (159)
Total	3.04	3.19	3.29
Males	2.98	3.15	3.10
Females	3.08	3.22	3.41
In-school	3.15	3.26	3.43
Drop-out	2.64	2.80	2.70

[a] In view of the limited degree of desegregation in the schools in our sample, we classified the respondents' desegregated school experience as follows: "none" when they reported all the students were Negro in their 12th, 9th, 6th and 3rd grades and/or did not report any white fellow students in any of these grades; as "most" when half or most the students are reported as white in any of these grades; in all other cases they are classified as "little."

in Table 24. Female academics seem to be more responsive to such desegregation experiences than other subgroups. When a chi-square test was used to check the significance of the high gamma coefficients, several of these coefficients (marrying, dating, having a white teacher, going to a predominantly white school) as indicated by asterisks proved to be significant at the .05 level or less. Although for males in either subgroup, few of the gamma coefficients are high enough to indicate a strong relationship, it is suggestive that for both subgroups the correlation with the close friendship item is inverse and, for other items there are twice as many inverse correlations for the drop-outs as for the seniors. Obviously the effect of school desegregation is a selective one, and should be re-examined in combination with other factors. To what extent these potent "other factors" are psychological

TABLE 24

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S INTEGRATED SCHOOL EXPERIENCE AND HIS WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE INDEX AS MEASURED BY GAMMA COEFFICIENT BY SEX AND SCHOOL STATUS

Situation	Males		Females	
	Academics (134)	Drop-Outs (50)	Academics (212)	Vocationals (107)
Club, mostly white	.059	.013	.121	.127
Club, mostly Negro; few whites	.081	.090	-.135	.144
Club, half Negro; half white	-.143	-.292	.095	-.061
Marrying a white person	.198	.240	.409[a]	.083
Work under a white person	.123	-.028	.174	.157
Work side by side with whites	-.227	-.145	.433	.441
Church, mostly white	.148	.310	.291	.363
Church, half Negro; half white	.106	.128	.249	.115
Church, mostly Negro; few white	.034	.053	.081	-.078
Dating a white person	-.124	-.143	.330[a]	.161
Close friend, white	-.407	-.023	.206	.100
White teacher	.036	-.065	.268[a]	.197
School, mostly white	.258	-.055	.425[a]	.265
School, half Negro; half white	.080	-.118	.364	.063
School, mostly Negro; few whites	.117	-.204	.239	.181
Mean	.014	-.027	.335	.205

[a] On the basis of the chi square test, this statistic is significant at the confidence level of at least .05.

attributes of the general social structure, or peculiar to the particular school conditions to which pupils are exposed cannot be determined without further research. However, for all the in-school groups, the willingness to attend predominantly white schools is positively correlated--sometimes quite highly--with the degree of their previous desegregation experience.[1] Since most of the relationships shown on our table do not meet the 5 per cent level of significance test, we cannot be sure they would recur in another similar study.

Experience with White Teachers

Another source of interracial exposure is experience with white teachers. The potential importance of white teachers in largely Negro schools has been carefully assessed in the Haryou investigation, reported as "Youth in the Ghetto; a study of the consequences of powerlessness and a blueprint for change."[2]

In a later summary of these findings Kenneth Clark pinpoints some of the issues: white teachers who feel they are in hostile territory and the Negro teachers who resent their presence can hardly be expected to work together without friction. Much of the feeling is repressed, however, and only emerges in depth interviews conducted in confidence. Negroes express the feeling that whites feel and act superior and "cold" even when they are less well educated.

---

[1] This finding is consistent with a study by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights, U. S. A. Public Schools Southern States, 1962, which is quoted in the Report of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967 and says "The inference is strong that Negro high school students prefer biracial education only if they have experienced it before. If a Negro student has not received his formative education in biracial schools, the chances are he will not choose to enter one in his more mature years" (p. 110).

[2] Youth in the Ghetto (3d. ed.); New York: Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, 1964).

The dominant and disturbing fact about the ghetto schools is that the teachers and the students regard each other as adversaries. Under these conditions the teachers are reluctant to teach and the students retaliate and resist learning.[1]

About 18 per cent of our total sample (but twice that proportion in the case of drop-outs) reported that they had never had any white teachers. Only 6 per cent of the total sample reported white teachers in all of the grades asked about, i.e., third, sixth, ninth or twelfth grades (but only 2 per cent of the drop-outs so reported). In each separate grade the drop-outs' experience with white teachers was less than that of the in-school subsample.

Many respondents were annoyed about being asked about their willingness to have white teachers. It appeared to them to be a fait accompli concerning which they had no choice. Nevertheless, the data show that this was a factor of more than minimal influence in their attitudes toward whites.

In each case, as demonstrated in Table 25, those who had experience with white teachers evidenced a greater average willingness to associate with whites than those who had not. Since this difference is not very marked,

TABLE 25

WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE INDEX FOR ALL RESPONDENTS
CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL STATUS AND SEX, CROSS-
CLASSIFIED BY EXPERIENCE WITH WHITE TEACHER

	In School				Out of School			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Number	Mean Index	Number	Mean Index	Number	Mean Index	Number	Mean Index
No white teacher	48	3.15	16	1.04	32	2.49	8	2.89
White teacher	121	3.35	284	3.30	47	2.73	23	2.99

---

[1] Clark, op. cit., p. 137.

this single variable does not appear to be important in the total interracial context.

The positive influence of the white teacher particularly on those individual activities which are school-oriented is demonstrated in Table 26 which lists for in- and out-of-school groups the gamma coefficients between their willingness to associate and the extent of their experience with white teachers. Again the females are more responsive than the males to an aspect of school experience and especially with regard to school-related items. The drop-out males seem to have been little affected by their limited experience with white teachers. The vocational school girls react more favorably to any interracial working experience when they have had white teachers. Again we see several strong relationships with regard to predominantly white or half-and-half church which also occurred in connection with some of the socio-economic variables. We wonder whether the recurrence of this strong and sometimes statistically significant correlation is explained by the double significance of church: (1) its significance in the total society, both as a part of the establishment and as its moral symbol; (2) its significance in the Negro community as a symbol of respectability and "getting along." This speculation would be better supported if the evidence were more consistent for all subgroups, but it merits re-testing in some further research.

On the hypothesis that the evaluation of the white teachers would be more sharply related to the willingness index than merely their presence, our respondents were asked to rate both Negro and white teachers in terms of how able and/or willing they were to help the student. Only a very small proportion of either Negro or white teachers was judged "unable to help."

Predictably, the white teacher evaluation was more correlated with the willingness index than mere exposure had been.

TABLE 26

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENTS' EXPERIENCE
WITH WHITE TEACHERS AND WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE INDEX
AS MEASURED BY GAMMA COEFFICIENT BY
SEX AND SCHOOL STATUS

Situation	Males		Females	
	Academic (135)	Drop-out (74)	Academic (219)	Vocational (109)
Club, mostly white	.010	.117	.172	.185
Club, mostly Negro; few whites	.122	.143	.091	.206
Club, half Negro; half white	.016	-.057	.114	.290
Marrying a white person	.120	.189	.228	.125
Work under a white person	.210	-.090	.125	.269
Work side by side with whites	-.107	-.080	.223	.434
Church, mostly white	.318	.249	.253[a]	.183
Church, half Negro; half white	.363[a]	.173	.104	.136
Church, mostly Negro; few whites	.182	.129	.257	.110
Dating a white person	-.121	.136	.219	.104
Close friend, white	-.022	.073	.135	.160
White teacher	.361[a]	-.061	.375	.306
School, mostly white	.239	.009	.303[a]	.363
School, half Negro; half white	.125	.084	.303	.395[a]
School, mostly Negro; few whites	.221	.119	.210	.491
Mean	.101	.107	.340[a]	.349

[a] On the basis of the chi square test, this statistic is significant at the confidence level of at least .05.

TABLE 27

WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE INDEX FOR ALL RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL STATUS AND SEX, CROSS-CLASSIFIED BY EVALUATION

	In School				Out of School			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Number	Mean Index	Number	Mean Index	Number	Mean Index	Number	Mean Index
Able and willing	110	3.45	266	3.36	35	2.75	20	3.16
All others	28	2.95	66	2.92	44	2.50	11	2.62

Informal Voluntary Contact with White Fellow Students

One of our original hypotheses was that the willingness index would not be affected by mere institutional propinquity so much as by the informal social contacts our respondents initiated themselves, inside, but more especially outside, of the desegregated institution. To test this hypothesis we first asked our respondents about the nature and extent of their informal contacts with white fellow students both in and out of school; then we related these figures to the willingness index. About 30 per cent reported that they had had no white fellow students. Slightly more had either no informal contacts at all or only slight contact with white fellow-students in school. A similar portion had frequent contacts or were good friends with white fellow students in school (Table 28). Out of school contacts were more restricted. More than half of those whose classes included white students either had absolutely no informal contacts with those white students or only slight contact out of school. A smaller per cent claimed frequent contacts or close friendships out of school. The extent of voluntary association between those of our subjects who had white fellow students and these white fellow students

TABLE 28

PER CENT OF MEMBERS OF EACH SUBGROUP, CROSS-CLASSIFIED BY EXTENT OF VOLUNTARY INFORMAL ASSOCIATION WITH WHITE FELLOW STUDENTS

	Experience Variables							
	In School				Out of School			
Subgroups	No Whites	Nothing to do with	Some	Often	No Whites	Nothing to do with	Some	Often
Male academics	29.4	4.4	26.5	39.7	25.4	10.4	38.8	25.4
Male drop-outs	30.0	22.2	16.7	30.6	30.0	26.4	18.1	25.0
Female academics	32.6	6.9	33.0	27.5	28.8	11.2	36.7	23.3
Female vocational	27.3	10.9	30.9	30.9	33.3	20.4	20.4	25.9
Female drop-outs	20.0	6.7	13.3	60.0	20.7	20.7	37.9	20.7

varied by subgroups as shown in Table 28 and we suspect varied greatly individually within subgroups. For instance the drop-out population tended to have less intimate association than the high school population.

The degree of voluntary, informal associations that Negro youth have had with their white fellow students is the one variable we have examined whose influence on willingness to associate is both strong, unambiguous, and statistically reliable. This is true with regard to social contacts in school but even more so with regard to social contacts out of school.

Table 29 which presents gamma coefficients between the willingness index and informal association within the school, shows meaningful correlations

TABLE 29

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENTS' DEALINGS WITH WHITE FELLOW STUDENTS IN SCHOOL AND HIS WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE INDEX AS MEASURED BY GAMMA COEFFICIENT BY SEX AND SCHOOL STATUS

Situation	Males		Females	
	Academic (136)	Drop-out (72)	Academic (218)	Vocational (110)
Club, mostly white	.251[a]	.082	.090	
Club, mostly Negro; few whites	.272[a]	-.152	.192	.027
Club, half Negro; half white	.254	-.014	.254	.129
Marrying a white person	.251[a]	.266[a]	.287[a]	.323[a]
Work under a white person	.203	-.053	.148	.239
Work side by side with whites	.338[a]	.125	.378	-.027
Church, mostly white	.218	.382	.163	.056
Church, half Negro; half white	.483[a]	.217	.196	-.122
Church, mostly Negro; few whites	.259	.047	.127	-.067
Dating a white person	.122	.057	.276[a]	.336[a]
Close friend, white	.229	.226	.375[a]	.161
White teacher	.664[a]	.010	.544[a]	.028
School, mostly white	.312[a]	.292	.307[a]	.303[a]
School, half Negro; half white	.458	-.021	.440[a]	.310
School, mostly Negro; few whites	.389	-.088	.175	.273
Mean	.384[a]	-.290	.292[a]	.263

[a] On the basis of the chi square test, this statistic is significant at the confidence level of at least .05.

not merely with obvious situations like going to predominantly white schools, but also with the less likely situations such as interracial marriage. Moreover, chi square tests show statistical significance levels of .05 or less for many of these correlations. Thus it is clearly and reliably demonstrated that persons who regarded some white fellow students as good friends in school or at least often "did special things together like lunch or clubs" in school were more likely to be willing to associate with whites in the many and various activities on our list.

Table 30 demonstrates again that in general the students who have the highest degree of willingness to associate are the ones who have had informal contacts with white fellow students, both in and out of school. For all of the five subgroups with respect to in-school contacts, and to four out of five of these subgroups (all except the vocationals) with respect to out-of-school contacts, the persons reporting that they have had interracial social contacts have the greatest proportion in the high level of willingness category.

However, the percentages with high levels of willingness are greater when there have been outside of school assoications than when there have only been inside of school associations with white fellow students.

We suspect that this inside of school/outside of school social contacts differential here has the same significance for our population as Gans found in the daytime/evening social contact differential between Jews and gentiles in a suburban community.[1] The really intimate socializing for youngsters occurs outside of school, just like for suburbanites it occurs outside of the daytime hours.

When we calculate the gamma coefficients between each individual item on our willingness list and the degree of outside of school social

---

[1] Herbert J. Gans, "Park Forest: Birth of a Jewish Community," Commentary, II (April, 1951), 330-39.

TABLE 30

PER CENT OF MEMBERS OF EACH SUBGROUP WITH DESIGNATED LEVELS OF WILLINGNESS CROSS-CLASSIFIED BY INFORMAL VOLUNTARY DEALINGS WITH WHITE FELLOW STUDENTS

Levels of Willingness by Subgroups	Social Contacts Inside of School					Social Contacts Outside of School				
	Total	No Whites	Nothing	Some	Often	Total	No Whites	Nothing	Some	Often
Male academic	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
high	53.7	50.0	33.3	27.8	75.9	53.7	47.1	14.3	50.0	82.4
medium	37.5	35.0	33.3	63.9	22.2	37.3	32.4	50.0	50.0	17.6
low	8.8	15.0	33.3	8.3	1.9	9.0	20.6	35.7	0.0	0.0
Male drop-out	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
high	13.9	9.1	12.5	8.3	27.7	13.9	9.1	5.3	15.4	27.8
medium	47.2	45.5	31.2	58.3	54.5	47.2	40.9	36.8	61.5	55.6
low	38.9	45.5	56.2	33.3	22.7	38.9	50.0	57.9	23.1	16.7
Female academic	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
high	50.0	43.7	13.3	51.4	65.0	49.8	33.9	29.2	54.4	72.0
medium	213.6	46.5	80.0	40.3	35.0	43.7	51.6	66.7	40.5	28.0
low	6.4	9.9	6.7	8.3	0.0	6.5	14.5	4.2	5.1	0.0
Female vocational	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
high	36.4	26.7	25.0	26.5	58.8	25.0	22.7	45.5	57.1	37.0
medium	51.8	63.3	66.7	58.8	29.4	61.1	59.1	45.5	35.7	50.9
low	11.8	10.0	8.3	14.7	11.8	13.9	18.2	9.1	7.1	12.0
Female drop-out	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
high	20.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	27.8	20.7	16.7	0.0	27.3	33.3
medium	56.7	33.3	50.0	75.0	61.1	55.2	33.3	50.0	72.7	50.0
low	23.3	50.0	50.0	25.0	11.1	24.1	50.0	50.0	0.0	16.7

contact with white fellow students, a strong and statistically significant correlation is noted for almost every activity. The academic students of both sexes are more sensitive than others to this influence. In fact for the male academic, the gamma coefficient exceeds .25 (which was our criterion of a strong relationship) in every single activity; moreover, in all activities the confidence level, as determined by the chi square test, was unusual, averaging less than .001 except for the three situations which were predominantly Negro and involved only a few whites.

These impressive correlations--both strong and statistically significant--between out of school social contacts and willingness to associate with whites raise a question about the possibility of circular reasoning, i.e., is it not tautologically true that the people who associate with whites are the people who are willing to associate with whites?

Alternatively, it may be that willingness to associate with whites and seeking social contacts with white fellow students both reflect a common personality characteristic beyond the scope of this study.

To a degree there may indeed be some circularity of reasoning here. But this does not obviate the additional factors that are operative; we are not merely saying that those who socialize with white fellow students are the ones who are willing to socialize with white fellow students. We are saying in addition that those Negro young people who have a history of informal voluntary interracial associations with white fellow students demonstrate a predilection for further associations of considerable variety beyond the mere duplication of past experiences. We are saying that although there has been evidence both in our own studies and in those of other researchers, that some kinds of interracial familiarity breed contempt, this does not seem to occur in our situation when the familiarity is voluntary and non-

TABLE 31

DEGREE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENTS' DEALINGS WITH FELLOW STUDENTS OUT OF SCHOOL AND HIS WILLINGNESS TO ASSOCIATE INDEX AS MEASURED BY GAMMA COEFFICIENT BY SEX AND SCHOOL STATUS

Situation	Males		Females	
	Academic (134)	Drop-out (72)	Academic (215)	Vocational
Club, mostly white	.379[a]	.286[a]	.255[a]	.201
Club, mostly Negro; few whites	.371	-.027	.324	.181
Club, half Negro; half white	.417[a]	.116	.416	.292
Marrying a white person	.360[a]	.343	.350[a]	.382[a]
Work under a white person	.376[a]	-.083	.136	.156
Work side by side with whites	.340[a]	.300	.455	.149
Church, mostly white	.252[a]	.318	.264[a]	.123
Church, half Negro; half white	.439[a]	.290	.430	.062
Church, mostly Negro; few whites	.274	.050	.240	.025
Dating a white person	.267[a]	.055	.360[a]	.289[a]
Close friend, white	.396[a]	.274	.434[a]	.326
White teacher	.456[a]	.251	.632[a]	.265
School, mostly white	.321[a]	.336[a]	.358[a]	.334
School, half Negro; half white	.499[a]	.147	.511[a]	.437[a]
School, mostly Negro; few whites	.387	.023	.119	.352
Mean	.484[a]	.410	.451[a]	.339

[a] On the basis of the chi square test, this statistic is significant at the confidence level of at least .05.

institutional. Under these circumstances, the involved young Negro seems predisposed to further interracial involvement.

Moreover, if our index of previous interracial contact had not been limited to contact with white fellow-students but had covered a variety of other interracial dealings and had analyzed them in terms of the interracial equality or subordination involved, then the lessons to be learned with regard to the effect of interracial experience on interracial attitude would be broader. Nevertheless, the importance of this factor of primary relationships and mutual acceptance is not easily overstated with regard to the issue of school desegregation. Within the last year, the Coleman report of the Office of Education emphasized that quality of education was an important facet of the school desegregation issue. It was followed this year (1967) by the report of the Commission on Civil Rights which, while endorsing this concern with the tangibles and intangibles of school practices, maintains that the essential, unavoidable issue in educational achievement for the Negro child was the "school climate," which in turn was dependent on its racial composition. Our point of view, following from our data, emphasizes that the barometer of school climate is not merely an instrument which measures race ratio. It has to do with the quality of race relationships not merely the quantity.

CHAPTER VI

PATTERNS OF PREFERENCE FOR WHITE AND NEGRO ASSOCIATES

Introduction

Previous chapters have explored our sample's relative willingness to associate with whites in a variety of different activities and situations, as well as the relationship between the willingness index and other variables: parental education and occupation, the subject's own mobility aspirations, desegregated school experiences and informal voluntary association with white fellow students.

The present chapter inquires whether the same attitudes apply indiscriminately to all whites, or on what basis discriminations are made.

The very fact that sociologists ask members of any one ethnic group how they feel about associating with members of any other ethnic group reflects a sociological assumption that people do react in ethnic terms. To the extent that this assumption is not correct, the subjects' answers do not tell as much about their attitudes as about the sociologists.

When sociologists ask people about their preferences among different classes of particular ethnic groups, they may be making it more possible for respondents to express a more specific, personally meaningful choice, so long as the respondent normally reacts in class terms.

However, if the respondent is not class-oriented in his judgments, then the sociologist is just adding to or substituting one gross frame of reference--class--for another--race.

Among diverse pre-test respondents we found that class is often not a generally understood term, and not a generally used one. (See Appendix A regarding our experience with the class concept in the pre-tests.)

We tried, but could not find a common denominator term which would be generally meaningful to our respondents, which would separate the good whites from the bad, and which also would be applicable similarly for classifying Negroes. When Rokeach, a social psychologist was seeking to distinguish between race prejudice and other "belief systems" that might be misidentified as "race prejudice" he set down these requirements for an "adequate theory about prejudice":

> [It] should be able to take into account . . . the following differential attitudes: (1) toward different members of the minority group, (2) toward different members of the majority group, (3) toward those who agree regardless of ethnic character, and (4) those who disagree. It should also try to take into account (5) qualified, conditional acceptance as well as frank rejection as expressions of intolerance.[1]

His synopsis of findings "was that discriminatory preferences are made primarily on the basis of belief congruence rather than on a basis of ethnic or racial congruence."[2]

The "belief systems" on the basis of which he tested congeniality included both race issues and general issues. These findings have been substantiated in a number of replicated studies.[3] Still we chose not to use the Rokeach format in our own study because: (a) the categories of choice were not sufficiently inclusive, and (b) their focus was primarily on the one-to-one relationships between personally selected individuals of different races or ethnic groups and not with respect to more categorical contacts, while we are concerned with both.

---

[1] Milton Rokeach, *The Open and Closed Mind* (New York: Basic Books, 1960), p. 134.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 166.

[3] See for example, these reports of experiments with white subjects: Carole R. Smith, L. Williams and Richard H. Willis, "Race, Sex and Belief as Determinants of Friendship Acceptance," *The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, LXVII (February, 1967), 127-37; D. D. Stein, J. A. Hardyck, and M. B. Smith, "Race and Belief: An Open and Shut Case," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, I (1965), 281-89; and Milton Rokeach and Louis Mezei, "Race and Shared Belief as Factors in Social Choice," *Science*, CLI (January 14, 1966), 167-72.

Actually in this present study, an occasional respondent did comment in terms which neatly illustrate the Rokeach thesis. For example, there is the case of one unusually sophisticated high school senior who marked all individual activity items "4 completely willing" except churches which are either predominantly Negro or predominantly white. He comes from the midwest, and both of his parents are professionals with graduate work in college. He handles the question concerning the kinds of whites whom he prefers thus:

> I am willing to associate with anyone who is objective, open-minded and who has something to offer humanity. This reaction concerns my view on anyone be they Negro, Caucasian, or Mongoloid.

Then with regard to the question concerning the kinds of Negroes preferred he reiterates:

> I feel as I felt [above]--any person who has something to offer the world culturally, socially or intellectually I am willing to associate with.

The Negroes he rejects are

> Negroes who are "Uncle Tomish" or prejudiced and spongers on the world I tend to avoid. I don't think these people can offer anything but a hard way to go.

However, responses like these are extremely rare.

In oral interviews with Negro adults in New Orleans concerning their stereotyped conceptions of white people, Cothran included the following open-ended questions: (a) "What is the best type of white person that you know? Why?" and (b) "What is the worst type of white person that you know? Why?"[1]

---

[1] Cothran, "Negro Stereotyped Conceptions of White People," p. 234.

From the replies he derived the following classifications:[1]

upper class, rich people
intelligent, educated, liberal
middle class
religious type
Jews
no best type
poor whites
other

Since these terms do not correspond closely to the stereotypes or other conceptions of whites revealed in our own pre-tests, they were not deemed useful as a check-list in the present study.

Nor could we find any other set of common denominator term(s) categorizing different kinds of whites and Negroes which could be presented to our subjects. Thus our questionnaire design came to include a page of open-ended queries. Each respondent is asked (1) whether he feels the same toward all whites, (2) with what "kinds" of whites he is most willing to associate, and (3) with what "kinds" of whites he is most unwilling to associate. Then, to see whether and how the tests he applies toward whites are different from those he applies toward Negroes, the questions (2) and (3) above are repeated with regard to Negroes.

Basis for Choosing White Associates

In response to our questions, we learned that our subjects themselves asked three main questions about whites in considering them as associates: (1) What are their attitudes toward Negroes? (2) What are their other (non-interracial) attitudes and personal traits? (3) What are their socio-economic class characteristics? On the basis of what our respondents wrote we derived a code with the following specific categories of concern with respect to potential white associates:

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 250.

1. The attitudes of these whites toward Negroes
    - a. their personal attitudes (e.g., acceptance, friendliness, non-prejudice) toward individual respondent as a Negro or toward other Negroes
    - b. their interracial principles
2. Non-interracial attitudes and the personal traits of these whites
    - a. their being "in" with regard to teenage culture (e.g., having fun, going along with the gang)
    - b. their personal qualities not elsewhere classified (e.g., "nice," congenial, intelligent, sensitive)
3. Class characteristics of these whites--mainly those which sociologists generally and respondents sometimes interpret as "middle class"
    - a. their status or hard work (e.g., trying to get ahead; "background")
    - b. their propriety or cleanliness
    - c. their being on the same "level" as respondent

Personal Interracial Attitudes

By far the most frequent criterion in judging whites is how those whites judge Negroes. It is the criterion named by two-thirds of the respondents with regard to the kinds of whites with whom they are willing to associate, and by three-fourths of the respondents with regard to the kinds of whites with whom they are unwilling to associate.[1]

The preoccupation with white attitudes toward Negroes takes many forms:

> I am willing to associate with any whites who are willing to associate with me . . .
>
> . . . who don't intensely dislike Negroes.
>
> . . . who are not prejudice or don't show it.
>
> . . . who do not try to make you angry by saying things to harm you if you are a Negro.

---

[1] In retrospect one wonders whether and to what extent this preponderance of white-oriented replies can be attributed to the context in which the kinds-of-whites questions are asked--the context being an interracial questionnaire.

TABLE 32

KINDS OF WHITES WITH WHOM RESPONDENTS ARE WILLING TO ASSOCIATE

	Per cent Who Base Their Willingness on White Person's										Per cent who say "all whites are the same"
	Attitudes Toward Negro			Personal Traits			"Class" Qualities				
	Personal	Principles	Total	Being "in"	Other	Total	Nice appearance and behavior	Hard working getting ahead	"On my level"	Total	
Total	62	4	66	5	29	34	3	4	2	9	14
In-school	64	4	68	4	30	34	4	5	1	10	13
Drop-out	49	4	53	8	21	29	3	0	2	5	18
Males-total	55	2	57	7	23	30	3	6	0	9	18
Academic	61	1	62	6	27	33	4	6	0	10	15
Drop-out	45	2	47	7	14	21	1	0	0	1	30
Females-total	66	5	71	3	33	36	4	5	2	11	11
Academic	66	5	71	3	33	36	3	6	2	11	12
Vocational	68	2	70	3	30	33	4	4	1	9	12
Drop-out	61	6	67	6	39	45	6	0	6	12	0

TABLE 33

KINDS OF WHITES WITH WHOM RESPONDENTS ARE UNWILLING TO ASSOCIATE

	Per cent Who Base Their Unwillingness on White Person's									
	Attitudes Towards Negro			Personal Traits			"Class" Qualities			
	Per-sonal	Princi-ples	Total	Not Being "In"	Other	Total	Poor appear-ance & behavior	Lack industry and ambition	Not on my level	Total
Total	68	7	75	1	11	12	5	7	1	13
In-school	70	7	77	0	12	12	5	8	0	14
Drop-out	57	5	62	4	6	10	4	2	1	7
Males-total	59	8	67	3	5	8	5	7	0	12
In-school	64	9	73	1	6	7	6	11	0	17
Drop-out	48	6	54	5	5	10	3	1	0	4
Females-total	73	6	79	1	14	15	4	7	1	12
Academic	73	8	81	0	15	15	5	8	0	13
Vocational	73	4	77	0	12	12	3	7	1	11
Drop-out	75	3	78	0	10	10	9	3	3	15

> . . . white people that would stand by your side, like for instance in fights, etc.

"White people who do not think they are better than you," "who don't think they are above you"; "who will treat me as I would prefer to be treated (equal)." "They are the ones who don't care if you are purple."

Interracial Principles

In coding we tried to distinguish between those whose criterion was not merely the personal interracial attitude of a white person, but his interracial principles. We wanted to know to what extent our young subjects were motivated interracially by ideological concerns, or at least inclined to communicate in such terms. These are the terms of politics, but rarely were they the language of our respondents. Very few, only about 4 per cent, seemed clearly to express themselves in abstract interracial concepts such as "a person who is willing to accept the fact that all men are created equal regardless of Color, Race or Creed! ! !" or "who will understand the problem of Negroes."

While we also provided a separate code for principaled responses based on religious or ethical premises other than race, almost no one (about 2 per cent of the total sample) responded in these terms. Only very occasionally would someone specify that he would be most willing to associate with those whites who "are really trying to live a Christian life."

The largest number of our respondents think and feel, or at least express themselves, in personal terms rather than in terms of any kind of principles when considering the interracial attitudes of potential associates who are white.

Non-Interracial Attitudes

About half as many respondents seemed to classify whites on the basis of the personal attitudes of these whites toward people in general, not toward Negroes in particular. But here too, it was often hard to interpret on which of these two bases the classification was being made. For instance, the reply, "people that are nice and who I would feel at ease around" was coded as "people in general." However, when that same respondent designated his unwillingness to associate with the "kinds of people that are only nice toward you because it is polite and all the time you know they don't like you," he may well have been replying in racial terms and was coded accordingly. Answers which were more unambiguously personal were "people who are kind and nice, intelligent" or "with pleasant and pleasing personality."

Occasionally, acceptance by this young, Negro population appeared to hinge on the whites' being "in" in a teen-culture or peer-group. One female drop-out accepted white "girls that are hep or somewhat like Negro's because I have a few friends like that" and one male drop-out preferred "the kind that would be willing to go along with the crowd and with anybody he's around."

Class Characteristics

As the tables show, socio-economic class is of very minor concern in choosing white associates. "Middle class criteria," e.g., propriety, decency, status, are suggested by only about 10 per cent of the respondents. Qualities of status: striving for status or having achieved it are reflected by preferences for "the educated" and rejection of "the uneducated and illiterate," or often, of "poor white trash."[1] Qualities of appearance and behavior are sometimes specified, as in willingness-to-associate with "anyone who conducts himself or herself as a decent and respectful person" or has "good manners." One student who curtly rejects "thugs and vandals," accepts "cooperative citizens." Occasionally, the specific term "middle class" is used, or "better class" or "higher class," with or without behavioral explanations. More often, the middle class syndrome has just been assumed by the researcher when a variety of propriety, decency and status terms are given by the respondent.[1]

---

[1] In our pre-tests, this frequently expressed scorn of poor white trash was explained in these terms: white folks, in contrast to Negroes, have so many chances to get ahead that those who fail must be no good at all.

When a few additional persons say something like "I would be willing to associate with white on my level and not under my level," it is far from certain whether or not "level" in this case means socio-economic class level.

There are also respondents for whom the middle class label is actually a basis for rejection rather than acceptance. One respondent, for instance, prefers "white people of low income. Because we are just about in the same shape"; adding parenthetically, the word "understanding." The same respondent declares herself most unwilling to associate with "middle and high class whites because they think they are better than colored people. If we move into their neighborhood, they will move."

A good many answers include multiple criteria of acceptability and are therefore doubly or triply coded as personal traits, class traits, and personal interracial attitudes:

> Kind, respectable people who are not prejudiced about others.
>
> White persons who are clean, well-groomed and easy to get along with and one who wouldn't care what race you are.
>
> The white people who have a very nice personality, good manners, and someone who would like one for myself.

---

[1] We are aware that to the respondent, these references may not always have signified "middle class" or even "class." First, as explained earlier, the "class" concept is more certain to be found in the mind of the researcher than in the mind of the research subject. Second, "middle class traits" may not be a valid concept. The above-mentioned traits may be emphasized at least equally much by the "poor-but-honest," stable members of the Negro and white working class.

A small number of responses indicate that an exploitative motivation underlies a willingness-to-associate with such whites as those who "are suckers" and/or who "will buy me drinks and give me money."[1]

Less than 15 per cent indicate (merely checking the provided space) that they feel "the same way towards all white people," and list no "kinds of white people" with whom they would be most willing, and most unwilling, to associate.

In summary, with regard to the kinds of whites with whom respondents are willing to associate, these general patterns prevail throughout the sample: the most frequently cited criterion is that of favorable attitudes toward Negroes. Personal (not racially-oriented) attitudes and traits of whites are mentioned much less often. A small portion regard all whites as the same and make no selection at all and an even smaller fraction of respondents refer to preferred class qualities.

Basis for Rejecting Whites

Personal Racial Attitudes

The same patterns apply--in reverse--with regard to the kinds of whites with whom respondents are unwilling to associate. For instance, there is clear rejection of those who "think they are better than you." The unwillingness questions elicit fuller replies and greater vehemence. Thus, one respondent who expresses his unwillingness briefly in terms of "no hostility" and "feeling of equality," replies more emphatically with respect to his unwillingness: "the deep down poor and some rich southern whites who don't know when slavery ended and those who think Negroes are brainless and below them." In the "most unwilling" replies, much sensitivity is evidenced toward hypocrisy on the part of whites who

---

[1] This exploitative attitude toward whites was spelled out in greater detail in a variety of pre-test interviews. For example, several medical students who "prefer not to be bothered with them (i.e., whites) unless it is to my advantage," therefore totally rejected lower class whites who "cannot do anything to help me." Similarly, with regard to the question about willingness to marry upper class whites and Jews, several freshmen girls replied, "Why not, upper class and Jews are rich and would mean security." Reversing the sexes, one embittered Negro male who felt that "white women have a misconception about Negro manhood" regards them as "just things" to be bothered with only if he needs them. He explains that he is merely reciprocating the attitude whites have toward Negroes.

> "show teeth," merely pretending to be friendly--the ones who are friendly to you on the outside but hate you on the inside.
>
> that would smile in your face and laugh behind your back and call you black.
>
> talk like a dog about you when you are not there.

Again, the oral pre-test interviews are more eloquent than the brief written notations on the questionnaire. For example, the following notes were taken from an interview with a West Indian student, who first encountered white Americans when he entered the U. S. army and was stationed in the United States. He says he--

> detests them completely, and does not want anything to do with them. Their attempts at friendship are completely phony; they make no attempt to understand me or any Negro as an individual.

He is convinced that

> none of them are going to stick out their necks for Negroes, not even the really friendly whites [that he met] in undergrad school. [He feels that he] can be a friend to them, but not a true friend.

Class Characteristics

Among the socio-economic class category of rejections, there is specified "low-life gutter type" and as we have mentioned before, "the poor white trash that the white people of the better class do not like associating with. The ones they pretend they don't have." One respondent willing to associate with "middle class white people who are clean and intelligent," said she "would not want to be associated with the lower class whites such as people who keep dirty homes and keep themselves dirty," and went on to explain, "not that I am of a higher class. I am a clean person and want to be around clean people . . ."

Others reject not merely the "poor ones" but the "one who has a lot of money," "upper class who think that the Negroes are to be downed all the time."

Also specifically rejected are criminals, mentioned a dozen times or so, and K. K. K., segregationists, pre-judgers, and klansmen. Specified less often are police, Jews, grown-ups, or "those of the older generation because they have many prejudices from the old times." Also specified are young people and whites who over-identify with Negroes, "who continually remark about how they hate white people and would rather be a Negro."

In general, objectionable interracial attitudes are mentioned as a basis for rejecting whites considerably more often than positive interracial principles are mentioned as a basis for accepting whites. Objectionable class traits are mentioned as a basis for rejecting whites somewhat more often than positive class traits are mentioned as a basis for accepting them. However, personal qualities are more frequently mentioned as a basis for acceptance than rejection. Apparently when these young Negroes get beyond the categorical caste and class basis for avoiding interracial association, they have slight inclination for rejection of whites on personal predicates.

While the general patterns of acceptability described above prevail throughout the sample, there are some in-school/out-of-school differentials and sex differentials. For example, the male drop-outs give fewer answers in all categories of both willingness and unwillingness. They check more often "no selection," and "the same way towards all white people." They also reject whites who are not "in."

While the female drop-outs, as compared with females in school, also give fewer answers and frequently choose the category "no selection," they do not feel "the same way towards all white people." In comparison with the male drop-outs, they show a surprising concern with class and personal traits of potential white associates.

Basis for Choosing Negro Associates

Our sample's main concern about white associates is their attitude toward Negroes. The main concern about Negro associates is the kind of people they are. In conspicuous contrast with the criteria for selecting white associates is the relatively low percentage of race-oriented answers and the relatively high percentage of personal and class criteria for Negro associates (see Tables 34 and 35). Expressed in caste-class concepts, this contrast means that interracial contacts are defined primarily in terms of the caste relationship and intraracial contacts are defined in class terms, or in more personal terms.

Over and over again, however, the "personal" traits deemed desirable even among Negro associates have more than personal significance. They derive from minority group history, status, and problems. Sometimes they reflect a consciousness of caste stereotypes, and an attempt to disidentify self with the dominant group's objectionable "typical Negro" stereotype. For instance, in one high school, a senior who is "most willing" to associate with those Negroes "who act human and have the same respect for whites that they expect from them," declares herself "most unwilling" to associate with 'Niggerish' Negroes who act loud and rowdy and don't have respect or consideration for fellow humans." In another school, a girl who favors "those who are cultured and refined and who have a purpose in life, also friendly" rejects "loud, boisterous, uncouth, sloppy typical Negroes such as some of those at _____"

TABLE 34

KINDS OF NEGROES RESPONDENTS ARE "MOST WILLING TO ASSOCIATE WITH" (PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS DESIGNATING EACH KIND)

Category of Respondent		Specified Kinds of Negroes--Ones with Certain--												No Selection "All Negroes"
		Racial Attitudes					Class Traits				Personal Traits			
		Toward Negroes												
		Personal	Principle	Total	Toward whites	Total	Appearance deportment	Hard work; status	"On my level"	Total	"Being in"	Others	Total	
Total	582	10	2	12	9	22	15	14	3	32	6	51	58	6
In-school	471	11	3	13	11	24	15	16	3	34	5	52	57	5
Drop-out	111	6	1	7	4	12	14	4	5	23	12	51	62	10
Males-Total	218	6	3	9	4	13	16	10	4	30	9	43	52	8
Academic	138	7	4	12	5	17	17	13	5	35	7	42	49	6
Drop-out	80	4	1	5	1	6	16	4	1	21	12	47	59	12
Females-Total	364	13	2	15	13	27	14	16	3	32	4	56	61	4
Academic	221	11	2	24	12	36	15	18	2	36	4	56	60	5
Vocational	112	15	2	17	14	31	13	15	1	29	4	56	59	4
Drop-out	31	13	0	13	13	26	10	3	16	29	10	61	71	3

TABLE 35

KINDS OF NEGROES RESPONDENTS ARE "MOST UNWILLING TO ASSOCIATE WITH"
(PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS DESIGNATING EACH KIND)

Category of Respondent	Specified Kinds of Neg[illegible]--Ones With Certain--											
	Racial Attitudes					Class Traits				Personal Traits		
	Toward Negroes											
	Per-sonal	Prin-ciple	Total	Toward whites	Total	Appear-ance; deport-ment	Lazy low status	Not "on my level"	Total	Square; not "in"	Others	Total
Total	20	2	21	11	33	34	12	1	47	0	31	31
In-school	20	2	22	13	35	35	14	1	50	0	31	31
Out-of-school	18	0	18	4	31	31	4	2	35	2	31	33
Males-Total	13	1	14	5	19	37	8	0	45	1	24	25
Academic	13	1	14	9	23	40	11	1	51	1	21	22
Drop-out	14	0	14	0	14	6	2	0	9	2	30	32
Female-Total	24	2	25	15	41	32	15	2	48	0	35	35
Academic	23	2	25	14	39	35	15	1	51	0	35	35
Vocational	22	2	24	18	42	29	16	0	45	0	35	35
Drop-out	29	0	29	13	42	16	10	6	32	0	35	35

and she names her own high school. A student at a third school accepts "those Negroes who act intelligently and disprove the theory that Negroes aren't anything but 'Black trash,'" and rejects "those who fit the term 'Nigger' and try to prove that we aren't equal to the white race." Others are unwilling to associate with "Negroes from down South" and "Negroes in gangs."

Among the personal traits that are mentioned dozens of times in selecting or rejecting Negro associates are self-respect and respect for others. Conceivably, this emphasis emerges as an over-compensation for the Negroes' caste-like deprivations. Without a white control group, these data alone are not sufficient to judge whether the emphasis on self-respect and respect for others is characteristic of contemporary youth in general, or only of the Negro segment. The quality of "snobbishness" is also repeatedly singled out as a special concern, and may similarly connote a minority group sensitivity.

Even more frequently verbalized is the unwillingness to associate with "anyone who is unwilling to associate with me." When these replies were made vis-à-vis whites, they seemed possibly to signify dependency and a low self-esteem (i.e., it's up to the other fellow to decide whether we are to have a relationship, and if he only accepts me, I'll certainly accept him). In the present context, vis-à-vis Negroes, this interpretation may also apply. In fact, it conforms to the theory that Negro personality, adapting by necessity to coping with white, develops characteristics of dependency and low self-esteem which remain in intragroup relationships as well.

However, it is equally reasonable to postulate that in some cases these answers may connote instead a self-respecting unwillingness to force oneself on others, coupled with a high measure of democratic tolerance, and a social policy of non-discrimination. Without examination in greater depth, these different interpretations remain in the realm of speculation.

Rarely is a reply which is coded as "personal" exclusively that. (Of course it is inconceivable to the sociological mind that either vocabulary or values can be exclusively personal.) A few terms such as "intelligent," "sensitive," "kind and friendly" are relatively distinct from other categories in our code. Other "personal terms" such as "congenial" are based on unknown points of reference. Other personal considerations in choosing Negro associates border or overlap criteria conventionally labeled as middle-class. For example, one vocational school girl is willing to associate with "the ones that carry themselves in a way suited for them, with honor, dignity" and rejects those who are "loud and uncouth." Another prefers "the refined type." Repeatedly, there is a strong selection of those "who don't get you in trouble." It is frequently qualified by the phrase "but can take care of themselves when trouble comes their way," or "can help me when in trouble."

When a student replies that she is most willing to associate with "the kinds of Negroes that will always help you in any way, like for instance when a white group jump one Negro and you go and call for help," it again appears that this personal quality (i.e., helpfulness) is not exclusively "personal" either. It may be seen instead as having a survival function for a harrassed minority group. At times, the emphasis which we regard as "middle class" is not so much on good behavior but on striving "to get ahead in life." In other instances, both aspects are combined in a recognizable middle-class syndrome as in the case of one high school senior who endorses those Negroes who meet the four requirements: "well-mannered, highly rated, most interest in his future, always ready on a job." Class is more frequently a basis for rejecting Negro associates than for accepting them. The objectionable character of loud, boisterous, troublesome behavior is a real barrier to association. Such clear deviants as "dope addicts, alcoholics which would draw trouble any place any time" are also firmly rejected.

Other times, not class, but age appears to be the reference group. In choosing Negro associates, there is a considerable preference for "the kind that like to have fun and enjoyment." The expression varies from a genteel preference by one out-of-school youth for "some nice girls and boys who like to go places, play games, dance, play cards, and the most of all is talking with each other" to the succinct selection by another of "all the girls who are giving up something." In the same teen-age idiom the kind who are rejected may be "uncool" or square.

Race references are not often made in choosing Negro associates. When replies expressed in terms of Negro and white racial attributes are combined, they do not total as much as half the number of replies based on personal characteristics. Racial concern in selecting Negro associates may be evidenced in different ways. For example, there may be approval of those Negro associates who show race loyalty either in ideology or in individual dealings. There may be disapproval of those whose personal behavior would disgrace the racial reputation, or who evidence lack of respect for fellow Negroes or who otherwise disassociate self from race:

> the kind of Negroes who know they are Negroes and not whites.
>
> Negroes who try to pass for white as if to be a Negro were a disgrace.
> Negroes who pretend to be better than other Negroes.

A corollary of requiring Negroes self-acceptance is often recognition that all Negroes are on a par, censoring Negroes who are "uppity" toward other Negroes.

There are repeated criticisms of "Uncle Tomishness": One respondent favors

> the ones that speak up for their race and not down it, [rejecting]

> the ones that let anything be said about them and not try to stand up for their right, and also the one who think they are better than another Negroes, but they are not.

There is also censure of those who

> keep the race down by criticizing and stopping the other man from getting ahead.

A sort of race identification is implied in the willingness of a few respondents to associate with "all Negroes," with no distinctions. One drop-out explains, "A Negro is a Negro; I am no better than he is, and he's no better than I am. . . ," while an academic senior declares, "I am willing to associate with just about any kind of Negro because I feel equal with them."

Answers indicating the selection of Negro associates on the basis of racial criteria often overlap or include other criteria. Thus one vocational school senior elucidates, "I would like to associate with a Negro who has a lot of respect for his race, the other race, and for himself. One whose manners are not of a low callous being."

In general, the viewpoints gleaned from the racially-oriented answers to our willingness-to-associate questions are many-sided and moderate. Often one reply expresses a dual obligation: toward Negroes and also toward whites; as in censoring the kind of Negro who is "Uncle Tomish or prejudiced and sponges on the world . . ." Moreover, there are occasional expressions of disapproval, among both academics and drop-outs of "those who think the whites owe them something," or ". . . who down every white person for no apparent reason. These Negroes have no tolerance."[1]

Our respondents tell us in several ways that they use the same criteria for considering white and Negro associates. Sometimes, in about 10 per cent of the cases, they say so explicitly, or use the same wording in their kinds-of-whites, kinds-of-Negroes willing-and-unwilling answers. For instance, a girl who declares herself most unwilling to associate with "low life gutter types" among whites does likewise with regard to Negroes. Others who write that they are most willing to associate with the kinds of whites "who would be most willing to associate with me" specify "same as above" with regard to Negroes. Or, another replies with regard to Negroes, "I feel just about the same as I do about white people. There are good and there are bad. I would like to associate with those I felt were good." This point of view is echoed in responses such as, "I have played with white children all my life and I found them no different than Negroes. I have worked for Negroes and whites and I still find no real difference."

---

[1] Although our questions were not designed to measure the extent or intensity of race pride or "Black Power" sentiments, we think that had these sentiments been strong in spring, 1965, among the young people in our sample, they would have been evidenced in response to the open-end questions.

The similarity of criteria for Negro and white associates may be masked by the coding of a given answer as "personal" when made with regard to the former, but "interracial" with regard to the latter associates. It is not always possible to interpret whether race or personal factors are involved, or both; the assumption of race involvement is made with regard to whites, but not with regard to Negroes. Although this assumption may not be valid in every case, general knowledge indicates that in most interracial relations in this country at this time, this assumption is realistic more often than not.

Only a handful of respondents screened Negro associates on the basis of their ethics, religion or politics. Several others required "respect for civil authority" and occasionally the poor were ruled out or the rich and occasionally, the "upper class Negroes."

In comparing the bases for accepting (Table 34) and those for rejecting (Table 35) Negro associates, certain contrasts appear. Personal traits are stipulated as a basis for acceptance in more than half the answers, but not for rejection. "Class qualities" are mentioned in rejections more frequently than in acceptances. While stated earlier, race-oriented replies are not so frequent with regard to Negro associates as with regard to white associates when they do appear, they are more often in a negative context. All this seems to confirm a general psychological (rather than racial) thesis that individual criteria are used in connection with people we like and know and categorical criteria with those whom we dislike or reject and therefore don't know, or don't know and therefore dislike.

Within the sample there are differentials on both girl/boy and in-school/out-of-school bases. In sheer quantity of response, girls tend to write more than boys. This sex differential is likely to result in exaggerated in-school/out-of-school differentials because it happens that our high school sample has more girls and our drop-out sample more boys. As contrasted with the in-school sample, a larger portion of out-of-school responses with regard to Negroes based their willingness to associate on a personal criterion and a larger portion of these personal criteria have to do with teen-age "in" traits.

About one-third of the total answers specified a class basis for choosing Negro associates. When these class references are subdivided in terms of references and appearance and general decency on the one hand, and of hard work and status on the other, another contrast emerges between the in- and out-of-school groups. The latter rarely talk of hard work and getting ahead. In fact, in this regard as in others, the drop-out male deviates from the sample pattern and mentions almost no status characteristics.

Development of Interracial Attitudes

In addition to the willingness instrument and the kinds-of-whites/kinds-of-Negroes open-end question, our study used one more approach in exploring Negro perspectives toward whites. At the close of the questionnaire session we asked,

> What do you think is the most important thing that has made you feel the way you do about whites? (On the other side of the sheet, please write both what this thing was and how it made you feel--for instance, did it make you like whites more, or trust them less, or such?)

While close to one-third of the respondents (more males than females) failed to answer this item, many used the question as a stimulus for free-association of ideas. Since they did not hew to the line of the question, it was not easy to classify the answers. The one "most important thing" named more than any other was the respondent's own personal experiences with whites, although it was designated in less than one-third of the responses.[1] The decisive personal experiences ranged from the seemingly most transitory: the use of a "disgusting" segregated toilet in a Florida gas station, to the most intimate and enduring: "One of the things which made me like whites is because my mother was one." A few replied that the qualities of the white as an individual were what was most important. Over one-fourth reiterated that their attitude toward whites is contingent upon the whites' attitude toward them. An age preference is expressed in a dozen or so cases, usually for young whites who are regarded as more favorable toward Negroes: "The most important thing was the teenagers. Most of the older adult teachers seemed to be prejudice . . ." But a few preferred older whites: "I have known some whites and can say that I trust them, if they have some age. These young whites are too high strung."

---

[1] Our pre-tests interviewees demonstrated greater inclination to go into detail on this score. For example, one student wrote: It was during elementary school that the problem of race relations became a reality for me. I had heard my parents remark about white people and also my peers make them. Being at a young age, I would imitate what they would say without thinking why. There was a particular instance made me know what it meant to be a Negro. There was a park about two blocks away from my house that had everything that I had learned to know as being fun. It was understood that I was never to go there because I was a Negro. I was never told this but was usually given the reply as to why "we have our own." I believe it was through this and other things that I became aware of my race and my connection with it. I could not go to certain places because they were for white only. Sometimes I would wish that I were white just to find out what made them so "special." When remarks were made towards me by white kids, I was told to ignore them. These answers as to why given by family and friends has stayed with me. Even now, when I see or am in interracial (social) gatherings, not meetings, I feel that "why do white people come to Negro gatherings when they have their own." And another said she was more influenced by other people's experiences than her own. After being in an Eastern city high school whose race composition was half and half she "still didn't carry much feeling one way or the other except maybe in social activities in school." Then, she reports, coming to an almost all-Negro college, Howard, "was and still is one of the greatest influences on my attitude towards whites. I learned a lot of things about whites and their biases that I did not come into direct contact with. Just being here at Howard and in the city of Washington, which is predominantly Negro has made my attitudes toward whites much stronger. I am no longer indifferent, but have animosity towards some whites."

In classifying each answer on the basis of how the reported "most important thing" contributed to willingness or unwillingness to associate with whites, over three times as many respondents report things which were favorable toward whites and/or contributed to willingness to associate rather than unwillingness. Most of the comments tend toward interracial amity, expressed at various private and public levels. For example, one vocational school senior volunteers, "I felt that both races had problems and the only way to solve these problems was to join them together and see how they could be made better and get a better understanding of each other."

Some respondents deliberately attempt to detoxify the racial element in Negro-white relations and render it benignly person-to-person. For example, one academic senior answers "the most important thing" question thus: "I don't feel that there was any particular incident or person who made me feel the way I do. I have always felt that all people deserved the same consideration and opportunities. I don't allow my feelings about white people to be influenced by the general racial atmosphere. I would evaluate any white person by the same standards as I would anyone else, which would be their feelings for me and their ability to help me understand and appreciate mankind with faults and virtues. I am willing to give anyone a fair chance who is willing to do the same for me."

Several go so far as to say they get along better with whites than

Negroes: "I feel that the most important thing that made me feel the way I do about whites was my association with them. I have found that as far as working conditions go I can get along far (respondent triple-underlines this word) better with whites than with Negroes. As far as outside activities I associate more with Negroes but am completely willing to share my time with whites." And then this secretarial trainee adds, "All of us have found at one time or another that there are a few bad eggs in all races and you can't condemn the whole race because of those few people."

There are several reminders that Negroes are also prejudiced against one another, "such as light-skinned and dark skinned" . . . "so why the big fuss about white and Negro relationships."

Conclusion

The findings with regard to the kinds of whites and of Negroes with whom our respondents are most willing and most unwilling to associate show how greatly Negro interracial attitudes are conditioned by and conditional upon white interracial attitudes. Considering whether or not to associate with whites, the Negro asks first, how do these whites feel about associating with me? He then suits his own disposition to his assessment of white predisposition.

We use the term "contingency factor" for this intervening variable in the Negro interracial perspective. In its prominence it distinguishes the interracial sentiments of minority group members from what is ordinarily known as "prejudice," and there is no precise counterpart for this factor in dominant group prejudice.

True, as social-psychological theories stress, in all interpersonal relations, without regard to race, the participants are mutually concerned with anticipating the responses of those with whom they interact. Moreover, in any kind of stratification system it is generally more incumbent upon the socially subordinate to pay close attention to the clues of his superiors.

In our own data, this concern with acceptance by others is even expressed by Negroes to a limited degree with regard to Negro associates. But what makes the contingency factor so noteworthy with regard to the Negro's interracial feelings is its emphasis, the fact that it is of such primary concern.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

In the spring of 1966 we measured an aspect of the interracial attitudes of 582 Negro youths in Washington, D. C., about 80 per cent high school seniors and 20 per cent drop-outs. We used a questionnaire which collected data on their willingness to associate with whites, socio-economic background and school desegregation experiences. Our index of interracial attitudes was based on the indicated degree (on a scale of 0 to 4) of willingness to associate with whites in 15 different kinds of interracial situations which varied in importance and familiarity to the subject, in intimacy of contact, and in group racial composition.

In addition to innumerable minor points, our major findings were: (1) there is not so much race prejudice (defining this term on the basis of unwillingness to associate with whites) among this population as we had assumed; and (2) the degree of willingness to associate varies principally with (a) the situation, (b) the school status of the young person, (c) the extent of his informal, voluntary experience with white fellow-students, and (d) the kinds of whites whom he perceives.

Our major theoretical contribution has to do with what seems to be the distinctive character of minority group prejudice as compared with dominant group prejudice. This difference, related to the subordinate, accommodative relationship of the Negro to whites, is so great that we generally prefer to avoid the term "prejudice." Perhaps "minority perspectives" would be better. We find that an important dimension of Negroes' willingness to associate with whites is their anticipation of the reaction of the whites to that association. We derive the formula "Negro disposition depends on white pre-disposition" and employ the phrase "contingency factor" to identify this phenomenon.

The Extent of Willingness to Associate With Whites

The mean willingness index score of our entire population was 3.16, which falls between the two categories, (3) "somewhat willing to associate" and (4) "completely willing to associate." Our expectations, stemming from sources as varied as newspaper headlines and interaction theory were that we would find greater anti-white sentiment than we actually did. Our original viewpoint was that the Negro side of interracial relations had been largely overlooked and that it was high time it be researched. We assumed that when this oversight had been corrected and Negro prejudice was properly researched, it would be discovered in all its quid-pro-quo enormity to be the reciprocal of white prejudice toward Negroes. Quantitatively, this does not turn out to be true. Nor is it completely true qualitatively. Interracial attitudes as experienced and expressed in a minority group are not merely a retaliative "counter-prejudice"[1] of dominant group prejudice. The prejudice phenomenon between the two groups is not analogous because it is complicated by their status differences. Sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander. Double standards do prevail in many social relationships, including those between minority and dominant group members. This is what we did not reckon with sufficiently in our anticipation of a high level of Negro hostility, as expressed in terms of unwillingness to associate with whites.

---

[1] Cothran, "Negro Stereotyped Conceptions of White People," p. 17.

Situational Differentials in Willingness

The range of mean willingness indexes for individual situations is from 1.67 to 3.70, demonstrating the unevenness of the interracial disposition. While there is markedly less willingness in certain intimate activities, noticeably marriage and dating which involve the interracial sex taboo, this is not true to the same extent in other intimate activities, e.g., friendship or social clubs, when the racial composition of the group involved is balanced or predominantly Negro. Moreover, attitudes toward participation in interracial churches, schools and clubs are more correlated with the racial composition of these groups than with the degree of intimacy in the activity itself. This we interpret as further evidence that interracial contact is not rejected per se, but when it involves a greater risk of non-acceptance by whites.

It is also noteworthy that the highest indexes are connected with those interracial situations with which the respondents have had opportunity to become familiar, regardless whether or not the activity is traditional acceptable.

In-School/Out-of-School Differentials in Willingness

Although females generally express greater willingness than males to associate with whites, except in the activities with sexual implications, the greatest consistent differential is between the in-school and drop-out populations. Neither the education nor occupation of our subjects' parents is decisive in determining the extent of willingness, nor is the subject's own mobility aspirations. The prepotence of the in-school/out-of-school factor in accounting for variance in interracial attitude suggests that it represents more than just a socio-economic dimension. It is an ethnocentric truism that the drop-out generally comes from what we call a "poorer" background whether by "poor" we mean less money, less education, less occupational prestige, or less of the material and non-material variables derived there from. But whatever the range of occupational and educational conditions in the drop-outs' background (and our data demonstrate a range), the drop-out is, in practical terms if not ideological rationale, an anti-establishmentarian. He is "way out," not only out of schools (which is the means in contemporary United States culture of inducting the sub-adult into the establishment) but "out of it" in general. He has been segregated, unintegrated and abandoned, not merely by the schools he has himself abandoned but by society at large. He is alienated, powerless, normless and socially isolated[1] in an anomic social world.[2] The Negro drop-out cannot feel close to the white "centre" of mass society, for his own life is lived at the darker rings of the periphery. He is an exception to the "moral equalitarianism" which Shils sees as the dynamic of modern mass democracy;[3] and he does not seem to be affected by the "dispersion of charisma from the center outward in the whole variety of ethnic groups and peoples." It is, therefore, he who shares least in "the ultimate values and beliefs which govern the society" and most lacks the "affirmative attitude toward established authority" which holds the society together. He also lacks an affirmative attitude toward the elite who wield this authority, and toward the structure of institutions, notably schools, at the center of the society. Indeed, the mean percentage of "completely willing" responses to the fifteen items on our test was only about 40 per cent for the drop-outs compared with close to 60 per cent for their in-school contemporaries.

---

[1] Dwight G. Dean, "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," *American Sociological Review*, XXVI (October, 1961), 753.

[2] A "strikingly high" correlation between perception of society as anomic and prevalence of prejudice against minority groups was found by Leo Srole in an unpublished study reported by Gordon Allport (*The Nature of Prejudice*, [Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1954], p. 225). The same correlation could be expected among Negroes. In fact, in a recent M. A. dissertation in the Washington, D. C. area statistically reliable differences in anti-white attitudes were found when 40 Negro delinquents were compared with 40 non-delinquents. The latter were judged on the basis of their answers to an orally administrated questionnaire to be "more embittered toward Caucasians and pessimistic about the future than non-delinquent boys" (Milton O. McGinty, "An Investigation of Racial Antagonism as a Possible Factor in the Delinquency of Negro Boys, [unpublished M. A. dissertation, The American University, Department of Psychology, Washington, D. C., 1957], p. 71).

[3] Edward Shils, "The Theory of Mass Society," *Diogenes*, XXIX (Fall, 1962, 45-66. See also, Edward Shils, "Centre and Periphery," in *The Logic of Personal Knowledge*, Essays presented to M. Polanyi (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1961).

School Experience Differential in Willingness

While the extent of desegregated school experience did not greatly affect the willingness index in this rather homogeneously segregated youth population, the salient school variable turns out to be the degree of voluntary informal contact between the subjects and their white fellow-students. For most individual activities and situations on our list of fifteen as well as for the mean willingness indexes, there is a distinct relationship between the extent of informal experience with white fellow-students and the degree of willingness to associate. This is almost invariably true when this informal experience has occurred outside the physical limits of the school, and the statistical significance of the findings is usually very high, sometimes beyond the .001 level. This well supports our hypothesis that institutional dictates or even formal "equal status associations" are not nearly so important in affecting attitudes as the informal, primary relationships which might or might not emerge in a formally desegregated institution.

The "Kinds of Whites" Differential in Willingness

When queried concerning the kinds of whites and Negroes whom they would select or reject as associates, our subjects stress the interracial attitudes of these whites toward Negroes. While there are some class and personal criteria for selecting associates which overlap for both Negroes and whites, the main test with regard to white associates is their willingness to associate with Negroes. This conspicuous finding also serves to re-emphasize how minority group disposition depends upon dominant group predisposition.

The Concept of Prejudice

There is, of course, no one official sociological definition for the term "prejudice," nor even a consensus on what points are its essential components. Allport emphasizes its negative and categorical quality: "an avertive or hostile attitude toward a person who belongs to a group simply because he belongs to that group, and is therefore presumed to have the objectionable qualities ascribed to the group."[1] Klineberg stresses that it is a pre-judgment, a "feeling or response to persons or things which is prior to and therefore not based upon, actual experience."[2] From other sources we get other adjectives such as ethnocentric, socially sanctioned, unwarranted, inflexible, hostile.

The Negro interracial attitudes which we have just examined in this study not only fail to meet such qualifications; they also have a distinctive quality of their own--the "contingency factor" referred to earlier.

First, let us in turn examine each of these elements in the prejudice concept: ethnocentrism; institutional sanction; irrationality; rigidity; antipathy.

Ethnocentrism

Negroes and whites are not simply equal-status groups eyeing each other from the parallel levels of their own separate but equal ethnocentrisms.

---

[1] Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, p. 7.

[2] Otto Klineberg, Social Psychology (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1954), p. 511.

E. Franklin Frazier has referred to the Negroes' frequent treatment as "wards of the white community"[1] and the difference between the expected response from ward and keeper is obvious. We have often heard references to a benign white person who "treated a Negro kindly"; it is hard to imagine the reverse phrasing of "a Negro treating a white kindly." Another example: a Washington newspaper, under headline "'Unfit' for South? New Baby Book Boycotted," tells this story:

> There is a "run" in Congress for old editions of "Infant Care," the Government's all-time best-seller.
>
> The reason: Some Dixie Congressmen consider the new edition, which came out last month, "unfit" for their Southern constituents because it contains large photographs of Negro babies.
>
> Representative McMillan, Democrat of South Carolina, said he would mail only the 1945 and 1951 editions to constituents who requested the bulletin. He has collected about 5,000 of the old editions . . .[2]

Minority groups, by definition, lack the privileges and rewards enjoyed by the dominant group. Some minorities, like Jews and Catholics, have developed a self-image and ideological rationalizations which strengthen them in their deprivations, justify their separation from the rest of society, and exclude others as they themselves have been excluded.

The Negroes' position has not been paralleled to the Jews and Catholics; it has been more caste-like. In a broad historic sense they have not enjoyed similar self-pride, although there have been separatist movements in every era,[3] and champions of Negritude. (A contemporary expression of this in-group pride is the romanticizing "soul"--that special in-group quality of pathos and joy and spontaneity of spirit that manifests itself in song and dance and even rubs off to grace ethnic food, or language, or people. A political manifestation of this is Black Power domestically, and Black Nationalism internationally.) In general, the Negro's attitude toward himself has, many analysts say, been one of racial self-hate,[1] a painful awareness of failure to meet the dominant physical, economic and social standards. G. Franklin Edwards summarizes this point of view succinctly: "The attitudes of the Negro toward himself are merely reciprocals of the attitudes of whites toward him."[2] But the summary overlooks a degree of in-group positivism described above, as well as Cothran's evidence that "Negro's conception of the white man's conception of the Negro deviates greatly from the Negro's conception of himself."[3] Without in-group pride, the Negro can rarely afford the luxury of uncomplicated prejudice; his reaction becomes ambivalent; as a subordinate, his interaction is characterized by accommodation to the dominant group expectations.

---

[1] E. Franklin Frazier, Race and Culture Contacts in the Modern World (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957), p. 204.

[2] Washington Star, July 27, 1963, p. 1.

[3] August Meier, Negro Thought in America, 1880-1915 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1963). See especially chapter xiv, "The Social and Intellectual Origins of the New Negro," pp. 256-78.

Institutional Sanction

Another important distinction between the dynamics of dominant group prejudice and minority group prejudice is the fact that while the former is, to an extent at least, institutionally endorsed, the latter derives its main sanction from in-groups and social movements. Contrast Negro interracial attitudes with this point Bettelheim and Janowitz make in terms of personal and social controls affecting white prejudice toward Negroes:

---

[1] While the classic statement of this Negro self-hate is that of Abraham Kardiner and Lionel Ovesey, The Mark of Oppression (New York: Norton, 1951), it has now become a popularly accepted point of view in the sociological literature, and is reflected in the recent phrasing "low self-esteem": William C. Kvaraceus et al., Negro Self-Concept (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965).

[2] G. Franklin Edwards, "Community and Class Realities: The Ordeal of Change," Daedalus (Winter, 1966), p. 3.

[3] Cothran, "Negro Conceptions of White People," loc. cit., p. 463.

In the case of the Negro, societal controls exercise a regulation and restraining influence only on what would be classified as "intense" intolerance, or open expressions of the desire for violence. Such violence is generally disapproved of by the controlling institutions--while they approve, if not enforce, stereotyped and outspoken attitudes. Therefore, those men who were strongly influenced by external controls were, in the majority, stereotyped and outspoken but not intense in their expressions of intolerance toward Negroes.[1]

Irrationality

"Without any foundation in fact or experiential acquaintance,"[2] is an important clause in another definition of prejudice. The total history of the Negro in the United States, as well as the personal biographies of contemporary Negroes, are filled with citations of rejection by whites. James Baldwin explains the perils of attempting to distinguish rationally between the very real injuries and the imagined ones:

> . . . every American Negro, therefore, risks having the gates of paranoia close on him. In a society that is entirely hostile, and, by its nature, seems determined to cut you down--that has cut down so many in the past and cuts down so many every day--it begins to be almost impossible to distinguish a real from a fancied injury. One can very quickly cease to attempt this distinction, and what is worse, one usually ceases to attempt it without realizing that one has done so. All doormen, for example, and a policeman have by now, for me, become exactly the same, and my style with them is designed simply to intimidate them before they can intimidate me. No doubt I am guilty of some injustice here, but it is irreducible, since I cannot risk assuming that the humanity of these people is more real to them than their uniforms. Most Negroes cannot risk assuming that the humanity of white people is more real to them than their color. And this leads, imperceptibly but inevitably, to a state of mind in which, having long ago learned to expect the worst, one finds it very easy to believe the worst. . . .[3]

An almost equally eloquent account comes from a student researcher's biography, historically significant because of the fame of the date on which it was written rather than the fame of the person who writes it:

---

[1] Bettelheim and Janowitz, Social Change and Prejudice, p. 258.

[2] Henry Pratt Fairchild (ed.), Dictionary of Sociology (Paterson, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1961), p. 246.

[3] James Baldwin, The Fire Next Time (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1964), pp. 93-94.

> Now it is September 1954--the first day of Junior High School. This year will always remain implanted in my mind for this was the year that all schools were desegregated and I would have the opportunity to go to school with my white friends. My mother bought me a new suit for this occasion and gave me instructions of how to behave and what I should not do. What I confronted at school is difficult to describe. There were only a handful of Negro students and about a thousand whites. They treated us very unfriendly. They yelled unfriendly shouts at us such as "Nigger go home, black is for Africa, we don't want to go to school with no niggers," and other like insults. Some of the whites refused to come to class and marched outside with signs. At the close of school, the first day, we, the Negro students, were beaten and chased home by a gang of delinquent white boys. I hated these guys at this time and wished that I could have revenge. As I said earlier in this paper my parents were and still are very good attenders at church and they tried to instill in me the right path to take. Therefore, I went back to school and received the same treatment as before. Gradually the situation lessened and I became adjusted to the whites as they became accustomed to me. I would write a complete book about my days in Junior High and High School, but. . . .

Certainly when individual Negroes are tentative, suspicious or even negative in approaching whites, their attitudes can hardly be described as "irrational" or "unwarranted"--adjectives often used to delineate conventional white prejudice about Negroes. Another student sums it up for us very well:

> I believe that many of the prejudices that exist are not justifiable. They have come about because of lack of educational teachings and experiences. Often these prejudices have no real basis or the basis has ceased to exist. . . .
>
> Nevertheless, I do believe that some of the prejudices are quite justifiable. Take the Negro-white relations, for example. I believe that the Negro has a right to feel some (if not a great deal) prejudice against the whites, since he himself (the Negro) has been in the past (and still is) treated so badly. However, this is the opinion of a prejudiced Negro, therefore my opinion could easily be considered one-sided.

Rigidity

One of the common tests of prejudice is its rigid quality, its impermeability to experience. But in their approach to whites, Negroes have characteristically been very tentative, unwilling to make the first move or throw the first stone. It is true that a good many of our respondents question the sincerity of even friendly-seeming whites, and almost unanimously our pre-test subjects stereotyped whites as "thinking they are better than us." Prejudices bordering on paranoia do exist, as Baldwin described, and they represent one extreme of the interracial attitude spectrum; they are illustrated also by the anger expressed in race riots and demonstrations. But at the other extreme is the total acceptance of whites expressed by so many of our subjects: "I'll be friends with anyone who will be friends with me." Far more frequent than either of these extremes, however, are the expressions of varying degrees of flexibility in interracial response. For instance, one student reported having cordial relationships and many good friends among white fellow-workers in a summer steel mill job; still he never accepted these friends' invitations to go out drinking after work, for fear that when alcoholically uninhibited they would reveal a heretofore-concealed prejudice. All whites are presumed guilty of prejudice, he conceded, until proved innocent. However, he did know some whites who had so proven themselves.

Antipathy

The fact that the object of the Negro's interracial feeling is also the model of many of his aspirations, converts much potential anti-white hostility into an amalgam of ambivalence and inconsistency. One doesn't knock what he wishes to join. The emotional release of clear-cut hostility is not for a dependent group unless it declares war or revolution on the rest of society. And this is what appears to be happening in the urban riots of the North and West. Even those Negro interracial feelings which to some researchers have looked like social distance prejudice and scored like social distance, are often not motivated so much (or at all) by hostility but by a realistic concern about probable non-acceptance by whites. Williams recognizes these varying "aspects" of social-distance feelings:

> (1) feelings of group difference, (2) dislike of the outgroup, (3) feelings of inappropriateness, (4) fear of anticipated reactions of the

> ingroup, (5) aversion to and fear of anticipated responses of the outgroup, (6) generalized feelings of shyness or discomfort regarding unfamiliar social situations.[1]

The acceptance of whites reported by our respondants is probably as honest as the conscious mind can get, given the limitations of a group-administered questionnaire. But the acceptance is complicated, and often neurotic, as psychiatrists tell us, with subconscious resentments, many of which are too imbedded to be probed with the tools of the sociological trade.

In addition to the self-hate phenomenon referred to elsewhere, psychoanalysts of individual Negroes have reported motivations which we cannot verify sociologically. For example, according to Helen N. McLean, "fear is probably the predominating feeling of any persecuted minority toward the strong dominating group . . . fear and hatred of the white man who has humiliated and frustrated him."[2]

There does appear to be a consensus among more recent psychologists who have used both direct observation and standardized personality tests to compare Negro subjects with whites, that while such comparisons suffer from the hazards of cross-cultural research, there are more often than among whites such distinctive symptoms of aggression, apathy and hedonism. "Regardless of class, one of the more difficult lessons that the Negro adolescent must learn is to suppress his aggressions and to erect a facade of contentment with the status quo of the caste system."[3] And sociologist E. Franklin Frazier, focussing particularly on the middle class Negro was deeply impressed that ". . . Even the middle class Negroes who gain a reputation for exhibiting

---

[1] Williams, op. cit., p. 29.

[2] Helen N. McLean, "Race Prejudice," The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XIV (October, 1944), 711.

[3] W. F. Brazziel, "Correlates of Southern Negro Personality," Journal of Social Issues, XX (April, 1964), 46-47, 51.

'objectively' and a 'statesman-like' attitude on racial discrimination harbor deep-seated hostilities toward whites."[1]

To whatever extent the assumption of unconscious anti-white Negro hostility, Negro interracial sentiment may be correct, cannot be understood simply as "the other side of the coin" of white prejudice toward Negroes.

The Contingency Factor

The subordinate minority group status, which in the case of the Negro is often caste-like, requires him to subordinate his responses to those of the white. As Hylan Lewis notes in describing a small Southern town in the 50's: "In general, life for the Negro in Kent tends to be race-ridden: considerations of ethnic role and status pervade every aspect of the life-death"[2] cycle and color a great deal of the minutiae of every day life; much of life consists of adjusting to, rationalizing, making consistent, or combatting the force and implications of ethnic role and status . . ." A similar observation is made in a study which is concerned with the Negro war veteran; his attitudes are described as a response to "what he sees and hears of white man's attitude toward the Negro."[3]

This sensitivity to white responses was phrased as "once burned, twice shy," by one pre-test respondent, a Negro religious education director in a liberal interracial church. Emphasizing the derivative character of Negro interracial sentiments, she objected to using the word "prejudice" and proposed instead "distrust," "suspicion born of experience," or "reluctance."

---

[1] E. Franklin Frazier, Black Bourgeoisie (New York: Collier, 1962), p. 225.

[2] Hylan Lewis, Blackways of Kent (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1955), p. 195.

[3] H. W. Roberts, "Prior Service Attitudes of 219 Negro Veterans," Journal of Negro Education, XXII (Fall, 1953), 455-65.

Pre-test interviewees pointed to other characteristics of Negro interracial attitudes--e.g., its compensatory, retaliative character.

> . . . the dominant group by nature of its definition means that it controls or carries the greatest weight and the minority group is very much resentful of this fact which I think helps to stimulate the prejudice . . . as the minority group either tries to compensate for the fact that they are under the dominant or as they seek a satisfactory retaliation.

Sometimes this Negro interracial sentiment not only reflects past injuries but prevents future ones. It is prophylactically practical, for to avoid whites is to avoid the risk inherent, at least latently, in interracial contact. As interpreted by a student interviewer,

> When a Negro is prejudiced toward whites, I think this is a "beat you to the punch" situation. In a lot of cases, I don't really think Negroes are prejudiced toward the whites but feel that they must act this way before someone of the white race has a chance to act upon them.

These indigenous comments about minority group prejudice converge into our one concept of the contingency factor. As we have phrased it elsewhere and certain observations of other writers seem to concur: Negro disposition toward whites is contingent on white predisposition toward Negroes.

This contingency factor is a kind of intervening variable between the Negro subject and the white object. There is no exact counterpart for this intervening variable in the prejudice structure of the white subject and the Negro object.

However, the white predisposition on which Negro disposition is contingent is not itself a constant. It is differently assumed or assessed by different persons and under different circumstances. For instance,

1. Sometimes white predisposition is rather freshly re-assessed for each contemplated contact.

2. Sometimes white predisposition is assumed rather completely on the basis of the subject's peculiar private experiences in the past.

3. Sometimes white predisposition is assumed on the basis of the collective experience of the Negro in America (or even the black people of the world), with alternative or combined emphases on the (a) current, (b) historical, (c) economic and (d) social factors.

4. Sometimes white predisposition upon whichever of the above bases it is assumed or assessed, is also perceived as varying with particular individual interracial activities.

Indeed, further concentration on this contingency factor may reveal additional dimensions for later investigation, such as its carry-over as an established personality trait into intra-racial dealings; its focus, not merely on white acceptance, but on equal-status acceptance and more.

Shortcomings and Limitations

The Sample

The limitations on generalizability from our sample include its locale and its sex composition. In Washington, D. C. as in many urban areas, the exodus of the white population from the central city results in increasing Negro concentration and de facto segregation just at that time when desegregation is being legally required and sometimes enforced. The early desegregation experience in Washington was marked by considerably less turmoil and violence than that in other cities, as described in the Superintendent of Schools 1957 report on school desegregation.[1]

This pamphlet may somewhat overstate the claim of interracial amity. There were quarrels between the Superintendent and the local Board of Education. These disagreements as well as community dissent reached headline proportions recently, climaxing in Dr. Hansen's resignation in July,

---

[1] Carl F. Hansen, Miracle of Social Adjustment (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith, 1957).

1967. Still many of his critics maintain that while he was equal to the job in the early stages of desegregation, he cannot cope with the newer developments. A recent editorial in The Washington Post refers to the changing trend of desegregation problems:

> Dr. Hansen, the Superintendent of Schools, has become the symbol of a period that is now ended in Washington. It was the period devoted to carrying out the Supreme Court's desegregation decisions. It was a period in which most of the School Board were white, most lived in the upper Northwest corner of the city, and most were the parents of children who had gone through the city schools many years before. . . .
>
> Dr. Hansen has honorably served nine years in the most difficult job in the governance of Washington. He leaves now because he cannot turn himself into another kind of man to run another kind of school system. The main business of the next Superintendent is not desegregation; it is effective teaching in wholly Negro schools and matching the standards of the suburban systems.[1]

In the current volatile racial situation, it is conceivable that the minimal one-year time lag between the collection of our data and its presentation produces some findings that might be different if the survey were performed today. However, in view of the nature of our basic question, which is not so closely geared to current events, we do not regard this as a very serious shortcoming.

The Focus on Attitudes

While there are advantages in the overview provided by a large-sample questionnaire approach, there are also certain basic limitations. There is first the basic methodological question of whether and how closely attitudes expressed in response to questionnaires correctly anticipate behavior.[2] In the classic sociological polemic on this score we ourselves are allied with the skeptical point of view. Our doubts on a broad theoretical basis are strengthened by those empirical researches in racial attitudes which have shown not only the circumstantial instability in the expression of attitudes and their unreliability upon repeated testing, but also by experiments which have demonstrated the inconsistency between expressed "tendencies to act" and subsequent or precedent acts.[1] Our doubts are further confirmed when a respondent balks at categorically replying to categorical questions, as for example, "Marrying a white person or dating a white person is something you can't say yes or no, you would have to know the person first."

---

[1] The Washington Post, July 5, 1967, p. A18.

[2] J. Milton Rosenberg et al., Attitude Organization and Change (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960) is concerned with the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of attitudes and some of the intervening variables in the sequence between feeling, expression and behavior.

Nevertheless, although expressed attitudes are indeed imperfect predictors (or reflectors) of behavior, they are the best we have, when proper adjustments are made for the multiplicity of relevant factors in a situation and the hierarchies of value orientations. Even when they do not adequately foretell behavior, they reveal the subjective "definition of the situation," whose understanding is a vital part of any sociological investigation.

The Questions Asked

Having settled on an attitudinal approach and a questionnaire technique, we selected and phrased a question which would be of maximal relevance to the potential for integration. "Are you willing to associate with whites?" We feel that the answers we have reported are operationally useful.

However, it would be a distortion of our findings to draw from them any inferences of emotional content of hostility or resentment, degrees of racial militancy, or differences in racial ideology.

---

[1] See Earl Raab (ed.), American Race Relations Today (Anchor Books; Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962), pp. 34-35. A slight disclaimer is in order here: The recognition of the basic problem in attitude research to which these experiments call attention is not tantamount to an endorsement of those experiments or their specific conclusions.

At an earlier stage of our study we did not fully appreciate what we recognize of major importance now: namely, that willingness to associate does not always signify an absence of prejudice and unwillingness does not always signify its presence. Hostility may exist in combination with or separate from willingness for interracial association.

Recognizing now the diverse strands of interracial attitudes—not merely the gross distinctions between stereotypes and social distance prejudice, but also some of the finer distinctions between hostility, resentment, discomfort--our design for any future study would measure each of these elements separately.

Schedule Construction

With benefit of extensive pre-tests, our final schedule presented no serious problems. The option of five possible replies in a Likert scale was well utilized by our respondents as tallies in Chapter III demonstrate.

Option "2, unsure" may have been differently interpreted by different respondents. Some used it to express apathy; others, ambivalence; for some it meant that they had never given the matter any thought, but for others it signified a serious doubt after careful contemplation. For still others it offered the lazy man's way out to avoid thinking, or possibly to circumvent vicarious involvement in emotionally hazardous experiences.

It would also be wrong to infer that a mark "4, completely willing" to associate with whites means preference for that association. There is adequate evidence that Negroes, like other minorities, may often "choose . . . to live in communities of their own because," says Handlin for example, they can thereby "best satisfy their social and cultural needs."[1] A similar implication can be drawn from Glazer and Moynihan's contention that later generations of ethnic minorities voluntarily eschew total assimilation for the gemeitlich kiet and other such satisfactions of remaining with persons of similar idiom and background.[2] The illusion here is not necessarily to a feeling of in-group superiority but of in-group "old shoe" familiarity. The present study does not prepare us to evaluate such inferences, but to recognize their importance is future hypotheses.

---

[1] Oscar Handlin, Fire Bell in the Night (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964).

As explained earlier in this paper the assumption of white willingness to associate with Negroes that respondents were requested to make was an impossible assumption for some of them.

Response, Reliability, and Validity

Respondent cooperativeness was high. Less than six schedules were weeded out at coding time because half of the answers or more were omitted. With regard to the willingness instrument on the basis of which the index was constructed, no more than three or four items were ever omitted for the entire sample of 582 respondents.

It was feared that to some extent a low willingness score for a particular activity might represent a rejection not of association with whites but of the particular activity itself--e.g., those who do not like school might register unwillingness to associate with whites in school.

Actually this did not occur. While in general girls were more cooperative than boys, and wrote more, and high school respondents were more cooperative than drop-outs, the differential on our willingness instrument was not sufficiently significant to affect the results.

The percentage of non-responses rose sharply on the parental education

---

[1] Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot (Cambridge, Mass: The M. I. T. Press, 1963).

and occupation items. Nevertheless our non-response rates compare favorably with that of other studies, as noted elsewhere in context. We do not think that the effect of the non-response biases our results.

Using as a criterion of reliability the consistency of response to the same items reappearing in different contexts or to logically interrelated items, there are indications of a degree of unreliability. For example, with regard to informal voluntary associations with white fellow-students, we asked separately about in-school and out-of-school contacts. One choice that could be checked in both cases was "no white fellow students"; the totals for this choice should have been equal in both cases. They were not. There was a percentage difference of this order: for male academics, 4 per cent; male drop-outs, 0 per cent; female academics 3.8 per cent; female vocationals, 6 per cent; female drop-outs, 0.7 per cent. Misunderstanding of the question could account for a part of the discrepancy; but a remaining portion of the discrepancy must be attributed to a quite small element of unreliability in response.

There is evidence that in matters of Negro attitudes toward whites which are emotional rather than factual,[1] questionnaire responses are not as reliable as they are with respect to factual questions. To get at sensitive matters of emotional concern, and to re-personalize the statistically segmented data, personal interviews would have been a useful complement to our statistical approach. Personal interviews would have had the potential not only of increasing the depth of our understanding, but of providing a second check on the reliability of our data.

A check on the validity of our interpretations would have been the use of a white control group to clarify the distinction between race-connected phenomena and merely age-connected ones.

---

[1] See reference to Eli Marks, Chapter I, p. 3.

Questionnaire Administration

Since this researcher is Caucasian, and also familiar with the general literature on the biasing effect of a white interviewer with Negro subjects,[1] Negro research assistants were assigned to administer all the questionnaires. Nevertheless, some of the respondents' written comments indicated that even when race is controlled, class and personality of the interviewer can be a nuisance variable. Considerably more surprising was the fact that in several research situations when the white research supervisor entered the room after the questionnaire had been administered, she was assumed to be Negro. A somewhat structured serendipitous experiment demonstrated that (a) the researcher may not know just how he is being perceived; and (b) he may well be assumed to be Negro by Negro research subjects on quite other than physical bases. The report of this experiment is herewith attached as Appendix C.

Other Perspectives in Examining Negro Views of Whites

Our sociological perspective is important; it should not be regarded as independently sufficient. Other points of view whose facts and insights should be combined with our own, like the economic, the psychoanalytic, the psychological, the academic-political, and activist-political which are not here taken into account. The contingency variable which we noted as an intervening variable in Negro interaction with whites, is not the only intervening variable. Such contributing factors as Negro in-group feeling, class feeling, personality structure, and idiosyncratic situational factors are outside the scope of this study. Structural factors, the economic institutions and other institutions also play a vital part in molding attitudes.

---

[1] See, for example, R. D. Trent, "The Color of the Investigator as a Variable in Experimental Research with Negro Subjects," Journal of Social Psychology, XL (1954), 281-87; I. Katz, O. S. Roberts and J. M. Robinson, "Effects of Difficulty, Race of Administrator, and Instructions on Negro Digit--Symbol Performance," ONR Technical Report, 1963; I. Katz, J. M. Robinson, E. G. Epps and Patricia Waly, "The Influence of Race of Experimenter and Instructions Upon the Expression of Hostility by Negro Boys," Journal of Social Issues, XX (April, 1964), 54-60.

Interpretations

Since the early days of sociological concern with "the race problem" in the United States, sociologists have constructed conceptual systems to explain how "the Negro"[1] as a member of a minority group or of a segment (class or ideological) of that group has attempted to adjust to, cope with, or correct his relationship to individual whites and/or the structure of white-dominated society. We have referred to some of these systems elsewhere, but they are not so relevant here, since our own research is not cast in any of these frameworks.[2]

Nevertheless our own observations suggest that some of the conventional sociological thinking about "the Negro" is out moded. We question, for example, the application to the Negro of the Linton concept of "modal personality,"[3] and the Kardiner and Ovesey formulation of the ever-present "Mark of oppression."[4] Instead, we are wary of the "danger of the overly simple view" of the "unimodal personality structure,"[1] and appreciate Sam M. Strong's analysis of the multiplicity of Negro "social types" that have developed along the major axes of Negro life.[2] While it is not directly within the scope of this thesis, our data suggest the usefulness of approaching the Negro personality in the manner Erik Erikson approached another minority individual, the Jew. Instead of defining one single "Jewish personality" he noted two opposite "trends" which he called "dogmatic orthodoxy" and "opportunistic adaptation." These two trends resulted from the centuries of dispersion which were historically so important in the case of the Jew:

---

[1] We use quotation marks around the term "the Negro" to indicate its dissociation from reality. There is no single prototype which can properly be called "the Negro" any more than there is a single prototype that can be called "the white man." At worst, such terms are odious stereotypes. At best, they are a kind of Weberian "ideal construct" to be used with scholarly caution by practicing sociologists.

[2] An ex post facto attempt to use our data to verify a hypothesis derived from one of these newer conceptual frameworks, that of "relative deprivation"--i.e., that the Negro's discontent with his own status is a result not of absolute conditions of living but of relative deprivation of comparative reference groups and membership reference groups--did not prove productive. This reflects against neither the hypothesis nor the data, but on the fact that our research is cast in a different conceptual design.

[3] Ralph Linton, The Cultural Background of Personality (New York: Appleton-Century, 1945.)

[4] Kardiner and Ovesey, op. cit.

> We may think here of types, such as the religiously dogmatic, culturally reactionary Jew, to whom change and time mean absolutely nothing: the Letter is his reality. And we may think of his opposite, the Jew to whom geographic dispersion and cultural multiplicity have become "second nature": relativism becomes for him the absolute, exchange value his tool.[3]

There are extreme types which can be seen as living caricatures: "the bearded Junin Ris Kaftan, and Sammy Glick. . . ." While varieties of behavior are almost as numerous as individuals, a similar bimodality of personality type appears to occur among Negroes also. One mode is the orientation to dominant group society; the other is the orientation to the minority group itself. In between are most of the subjects in our study as well as most of the Negroes in the country; for the two orientations are not totally discreet, but reside in varying degrees in the same individual. A few sketchy comments of each mode, and of the middle of the roaders follow:

---

[1] Alex Inkeles and Daniel J. Levinson, "National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Sociocultural Systems," in Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. Gardner Linzey (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954), p. 1015.

[2] Samuel M. Strong, "Social Types in the Negro Community of Chicago" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1940).

[3] Erik Erikson, Childhood and Society (New York: W. W. Norton, 1963), p. 355.

Rare is the minority group extremist who says, "Stop the white world. I want to get off." Some may eschew this part of the world and seek an actual or spiritual African homeland. More generally, Negroes know no fatherland but this, though they be only stepchildren in their fatherland.

Close to the extreme minority group orientation are the youth of the Black Nationalist and Black Power movements, for many of whom integration is not a goal. For some of them, the hated old slogan "separate but equal" has come to have a new validity; some claim that realistically integration is only for the middle classes; while for the lower class Negro immediate welfare goals take precedence over status goals.[1]

At the other extreme are the conformists to dominant group society. However they may be motivated, or psychologically complicated, their fitting-in is in the best style of contemporary sociological and psychological "adjustment" values. If one assumes that the present social order is the "constant," and personal "adjustments" to that social order are the variables, then the would-be conformists are the realists, the normalists. In this vein, many of our subjects reiterate in response to questions about having a white teacher or a white boss, "We have no choice. There are no others."

In between these two modes are the cultural pluralists, the gentler partisans of Negritude, the soul brothers and sisters. "Soul" has become the new ethnocentrism. It is to the Negro subcultural image what Black Power is to the Negro political image. It is the pendulum swing from self-hate, the denial-with-a-vengeance of Negro inferiority: the glorification of everything that is distinctively Negro--and the over compensatory conversion of even what is neutral, negative and questionable into a positive. It is the Orwellian reverse catechism: Black is good; white is bad, or if not totally bad, then at least spurious, watered down, second rate.

---

[1] James Q. Wilson, Negro Politics (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960).

Another in-between sort of accommodation is illustrated by a slogan from a non-sociological document entitled Joe Louis Milk Newsletter emanating from 6115 South Prairie Avenue in Chicago in summer 1966. It solicits patronage for its product from a Negro clientele, claiming to be "Not Anti-White, Just Pro Negro."

Cultural pluralism comes in other garbs as well. A more sophisticated form of coexistence is favored by Louis Lomax, who while appreciating the cooperation of the white liberal in the Civil Rights movement, rejects the "knee-jerk liberal who is full of sympathy for the Negro in general, but . . . knows nothing of our history and is not acquainted with a single Negro well enough to have him as a guest in his home."[1] A fuller explanation of the complicated relationship between Negroes and their staunchest white friends is offered by Kenneth Clark:

> The white liberal must be prepared, in this turbulent period of transition, to accept the fact that even his closest Negro friends will feel some hostility toward him. For if the white liberal can delude himself not believing himself color-blind, the Negro of insight and sensitivity cannot. To a Negro, every white person is, in a sense, a symbol of his own oppression. Almost every Negro who has white friends and associates suffers from feelings of ambivalence; every relationship of respect and affection that seems to transcend the racial and to be merely human causes the Negro to feel some sense of guilt and betrayal just because it does bring an experience of liberation from the bonds of inferior racial identification other Negroes have not been able to achieve. Many Negroes are caught in a gnawing sense of doubt, hostility, and guilt that interferes with any genuine affirmative relationship with whites--and even with Negroes themselves. The Negro tends to justify his own anxieties and ambivalence in self-protective ways, fearing to yield to the temptation to become a "show friend," ascribing to the white an inability to be a friend to a Negro. It would be too painful to realize that the guilt of unfulfilled friendship is in some measure his own. He may tell himself: I needn't feel guilty because my white friend is not really free to be my friend.[2]

Our willingness instrument is not designed to analyze the various kinds of interracial ideologies just described. It is not intended to classify Negro personalities nor to probe all interracial attitudes; it is not a valid index of resentment, hostility, militancy, politicization, or stereotypes. It does not purport to get to the heart of the urban crises of the day by testing riot-readiness. It simply asks young Negroes, "Are you willing to associate with whites in particular situations?" and the answer of all except the most alienated is generally, "Yes, quite willing, if they are willing to associate with me."

---

[1] Louis E. Lomax, The Negro Revolt (Signet Book; New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 203.

[2] Clark, op. cit., p. 238.

This is a worthwhile question, because it provides a basis for forecasting the readiness of Negro youth to participate in interracial democracy when and if it is finally achieved.

The young Negro has heard promises about this "democracy thing" from pulpits, political platforms and pedagogical podiums. But he has not experienced it very much. Its prerequisites are psychological, economic, political and social--and there is no set order in which these requirements should be listed, because they are mutual in influence and circular in causation. For example, "the deep longing of the colored people for freedom from contempt" has been highlighted as "the most important factor in the relation of the white and colored races all over the world."[1] At the same time the Negro's vulnerability to contempt is exacerbated and his threshold of fury is lowered by the weakness of his economic position, and by the hiatus between what he has and what he needs or has come to expect. It is his relative deprivation as well as his unfulfilled needs that intensify his sensitivity to what St. Clair Drake calls "victimization."[2] The essential economic component of

---

[1] Hans J. Morgenthau, "United States Policy Toward Africa," in Calvin W. Stillman (ed.), Africa in the Modern World (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), p. 235.

[2] Drake speaks of a dual victimization. In its direct form it denies the Negro power and franchise and permits such discriminations as schools, jobs and housing. These in turn result in the indirect victimization which limit his life chances and life style. Drake, loc. cit., p. 781.

Negro status has been under-emphasized in this sociologically-oriented paper, but there is endless evidence that the Negro's living standard falls far beneath the national norm, regardless by what index it is measured.

Economic problems in turn aggravate social problems. This is illustrated in a recent study by two sociologists who examined the relative extremism and violence in one Negro neighborhood compared with its absence in a similar neighborhood; the crucial difference between the two neighborhoods was the extent of their economic deprivation.[1]

With regard to schools, economic factors are closely involved in both equality and quality of education. "In school, as well as in the world, at large, opportunities are usually open to students or closed to them in accordance with their class position." Patricia Sexton generalizes in an empirical study of big city schools, after acknowledging the special disadvantages suffered by those poor who are also Negro.[2]

In light of these coercive economic factors, the schools cannot be counted on as a panacea for the race problem, whatever the degree of desegregation achieved, or the means by which it is achieved.

The schools have an additional limitation in changing the racial status quo because they are built in the image of the larger societies, and their institutional function is to socialize the child into that society.

But the schools cannot be bastions of traditional stability in educational form, content or organization when innovation and change are on the agenda of the society they serve. While the keepers of our educational institutions have never been able to answer affirmatively George S. Counts' hopefully rhetorical question of the '30's, "Dare the schools build a new social order?"[1] they must at least synchronize to the tempo of the day. The federal reports of the Office of Education and of the Commission on Civil Rights to which we have frequently referred in this thesis make many practical suggestions in this direction. Those suggestions are supplemented by the National Opinion Research Center's findings about the local political arrangements that have resulted in successful school desegregation, contrasted with those arrangements that have resulted in turmoil.[2]

---

[1] David Street and John C. Leggett, "Economic Deprivation and Extremes, A Study of Unemployed Negroes," American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (July, 1961), 53-58.

[2] Patricia Cayo Sexton, Education and Income (New York: The Viking Press, 1965), p. 16.

This study has shown a clear connection between rejection of whites by Negro youth and school drop-out status. If educators would truly seek strong democratic goals, then the schools must intensify their efforts to become both meaningful to and appreciative of the school drop-out and potential social alienate. This effort must go beyond the patronizing assistance to the "culturally deprived." Indeed there are risks in over-accepting this concept of the "culturally deprived" as there were in a previous era with the concept of biological inferiority, for it sets low aspiration level for teacher and student alike. The white educator who approaches his pupils with any suggestion of the patronizing air of the missionary among the benighted heathen, is doomed to personal rejection along with his program. Our respondents have amply demonstrated their sensitivity and antipathy to whites who "always think they are better than us."

If, on the other hand, the educator who sees such students not merely ethnocentrically in terms of their limitations in conforming to middle-class ideals, but open-mindedly, may discover as Frank Reissman did, some positive strengths that are not even shared by the privileged or over-privileged, for example:

---

[1] George S. Counts, Dare the School Build a New Social Order? (New York: The John Day Company, 1932).

[2] Robert L. Crain, School Desegregation in the North (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1966).

> the co-operativeness and mutual aid of the extended family; the avoidance of strain accompanying competitiveness and individualism; equalitarianism, informality and humor; freedom from self-blame and parental overprotection; children's enjoyment of each other's company; lessened sibling rivalry; security found in the extended family and a traditional outlook; enjoyment of music, games, sports, and cars; the ability to express anger; the freedom from being word-bound; the physical style involved in learning.[1]

Despite its limitations, Arnold Rose regards the school as in an especially strategic position for promoting interracial harmony. After a scholarly examination for Unesco of the causes and nature of prejudice, he declares:

> A tradition on which prejudice is based can be maintained only by being transmitted to children. If the transmission of prejudice through the home and play group can be counteracted by the school and church while the child's mind is still flexible, prejudice cannot long survive.[2]

In Retrospect and Prospect

This study's research conclusion of interracial assent may have at first appeared to be inconsistent with the dramatic evidence of interracial dissent in the cities of this land. But there is no real inconsistency.[3]

For the most part, the Negro youth in the newspaper headlines--and they could be our own--are not rioting because they want "out" from the white world, but because they want "in." They share the same values as their white peers, and covet the same rights and privileges, opportunities and rewards, necessities and luxuries. (This overview may not apply to the ideologically radical, nor the extremely alienated. It may apply less in periods of economic stress or social strain, like poor housing or summer heat and crowdedness.

---

[1] Frank Riessman, "The Culturally Deprived Child: A New View" in Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged, A Report of a Conference on Teaching Children and Youth Who are Educationally Disadvantaged, May 21-23, 1962 (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Bulletin No. 7; Washington, D. C., 1963), p. 9.

[2] Arnold Rose, Roots of Prejudice (Paris: Unesco, 1951), p. 40.

[3] The explanations we offer below do not strictly and inevitably flow from the research findings, but reflect the intermediacy of our own value judgments and the immediacy of our non-academic concerns.

But it does apply generally, to a large cross-section of the population, whom our data represent.)

The riots in today's headlines are not new. There is an eerie air of contemporary relevance in the report of a New York Mayor's Commission which in 1935 assigned these causes to a Harlem race riot: ". . . resentment against racial discrimination and poverty in the midst of plenty."[1] Like today's riots, those in 1935 were sparked by absurdly trivial incidents. Then as now the riots were a means of desperate, even suicidal communication. It was a cry of distress, mixing the pain and rage of the Negro who was being denied access to the only society and the only economy he knew.

When the rioting vandal destroys the property of a hated white storekeeper, he then loots it of the coveted symbols of white society: the TV, the sports shirt, the tangible trinket or the accessible necessity. Such destruction cannot be explained away as the machination of an outside practitioner of the new art of urban guerilla warfare. Nor is it an uncomplicated impulse act. It is symbolic of an emotional turmoil not unlike other ambivalences of love and hate with which we are familiar. It is the ambivalence of the black "marginal man" on the periphery of the white society.

One frank young Negro lady recollected how, in her Harlem youth, she delighted in the occasional accidental fires, which were absolutely the only way to get rid of rats and roaches. The flames destroyed nothing precious; there was nothing precious to be destroyed. The flames were a kind of purification rite, and they legitimized claims on the attention and generosity of others, claims effective only in crisis.

The young rioters who make "top news" of violence and hostility have an opposite message as well: that when and if economic conditions permit it, institutions honestly endorse it, and white people assure, reassure, sincere acceptance, these young Negroes are "quite willing" to live together in interracial amity.

---

[1] E. Franklin Frazier, Chairman, The Mayor's Commission, Report on the Conditions in Harlem, 1936. Quoted in Otley, op. cit., p. 153.

APPENDIX A

THE PRE-TESTS

In the fall of 1963, when one of my introductory sociology classes was studying the concepts of race and caste, the students themselves introduced into the discussion a Louis Harris poll of "What Whites Think About Negroes" which was currently appearing in Newsweek.[1]

Pursuant to this discussion, a research paper was assigned, based simply on the hypothesis that counter-prejudice is prevalent among Negroes. Each student was asked to discover whatever counter-prejudice he could find on the basis of participant observation in any one segment of the Negro population. He was required to identify specific forms of such counter-prejudice on two lists: a list of ten stereotypes depicting whites which are widely held by Negroes and a list of ten social distance situations in which Negroes would prefer to exclude whites or avoid association with them. Then he was required to perform a small pre-test with each list, using at least twenty subjects who were fairly homogeneous in terms of such obvious factors as age, sex, location, occupation and nature of interracial contacts. Each subject was asked whether he accepted or rejected the stereotypes presented by the student researcher, and to make any comments he wished. The students were then required to explain and interpret the findings of their pre-test and finally to re-evaluate their research instruments, samples and procedures.

---

[1] Newsweek, October 21, 1963, pp. 44-45.

Of course, the counter-prejudice lists of the thirty-one[1] student-researchers and the responses of their 600-some interviewees have serious limitations as a basis for any generalizing. Wording, samples and interview techniques are all unstandardized and reflect the broad range of skillfulness found in an undergraduate course. Besides, although much of the work was done not on campus but in home-towns over the Christmas holidays, one suspects a consistent middle-class bias, both in the way questions were framed and in the population segments selected for pre-test. Still there is freshness to the idiom and the observations, and the pre-test findings suggest realistic hypotheses for more disciplined empirical study in the future.

A summary of these findings revealed that the primary concern of the 245 stereotypes[2] which were listed repetitively was with how whites judged Negroes and acted toward Negroes. Resentful references to whites' feelings of superiority toward Negroes appeared in over half of the students' lists, whether phrased simply as "they think they are superior" or in variant forms such as, "whites believe their color represents purity" or "white people always think that they are better than any Negro no matter how low the white." There were also a good many negative terms such as "arrogant," "bossy," "domineering," and "undemocratic." Allegations made frequently were, "whites are good to Uncle Tom type Negroes," "whites are superficially friendly," "whites use Negroes for their own good." It appeared that the Negro's interracial attitude did not rest solely upon the whites' attitude toward him, but that he strongly endorsed a more equalitarian attitude. Thus, sample comments to the student interviewers included "I would mister a white person if he misters me," or "I would punish my child for calling a white person a cracker if the white person punished his for calling my child a cracker," or "I wouldn't mind a white person teaching my child, if he'd let a colored person teach his."

---

[1] Thirty-one members of the 35-student class were American Negroes.

[2] From the original total of 310 stereotypes submitted by 31 students, those items that appeared in only one list were deleted, leaving a total of 245.

A related category of "stereotypes" referred to the special privileges of whites. Some statements were hardly stereotypes at all, but simply social observations such as, "whites are more highly paid," or "whites have to do less to get more." While, in addition, there were many stereotypes referring (often invidiously) to the physical, psychological and moral traits of whites, by far the greatest preoccupation was with the white's non-acceptance of the Negro on an equal basis: personally, socially, economically.

Therefore, in the next research stage one hypothesis was: "A major concern among Negroes today is how they are viewed by whites and the differential opportunity and treatment they are afforded." Another hypothesis, also suggested by the initial study was: "some segments of the Negro population do not subscribe to emotional negative stereotyping of whites, but attempt to make more balanced individual judgments." The basic research instrument was a standardized "Statements about Whites" schedule which included stereotypes which had been most frequently mentioned in the initial study. These were interspersed with some other statements to give the respondent a chance to reply in a non-stereotypical fashion. Another innovation of this study was to ask the respondent to react separately with regard to "most upper class whites" and "most lower class whites." The purpose of this two-fold breakdown was to achieve comparability with other stereotype studies being conducted by Howard University psychologists. Sample selection and other procedures were similar to those of the previous semester. The student researchers were advised to encourage discussion but only after the standardized portion of the interview had been completed. These 34 statements were as follows:

feel superior to Negroes

are ignorant

have low morals

are industrious, hard-working

like to deal with Negroes who stand up for their rights

do not really understand Negroes

run everything

like only "Uncle Tom" types

have better hair

are loud, noisy

are not very capable sexually

get better jobs, even if not qualified

avoid associating with Negroes

don't practice what they preach

are intelligent

smell peculiar

are dishonest, insincere

distrust Negroes

have inferior rhythm and coordination

oppose the Civil Rights Movement

are lazy

have very high morals

really like Negroes

are ambitious

feel guilty about how Negroes are treated

judge Negroes by the worst type

secretly desire sex relations with Negroes

want to keep Negroes "in their place"

dislike Negroes

are neat and clean

try to help Negroes

under-rate Negroes' ability

are trustworthy

are physically dirty

Findings of this study were consistent with those of the preceding one. In addition, a class differential emerged in favor of the upper class whites. The informal interviewee comments were again a rich source for fresh insight into Negro interracial attitudes.

By now it was clear that Negro attitudes toward whites were not as consistently hostile as we had anticipated, however, and that prejudice with its connotation of antipathy, irrationality, irreversibility and ethnocentrism, might not be the best term to use for these attitudes. It appeared that social distance feelings might be a better index of interracial dispositions to act, than stereotypes. The studies in the next academic year--1964-1965--therefore focussed on willingness-to-associate.

The research protocol for one of these next studies explained:

> Our approach to social distance is through a schedule composed mainly of ten questions about practical situations in which interracial associations may or may not be acceptable to Negroes. These questions are asked separately with respect to working class, middle class and upper class whites.
>
> In keeping with the practical relevance of our inquiry, our queries are worded in terms of 'would you be willing to . . .'
>
> This positive wording (in contrast with such alternative terms as 'would you find it distasteful . . .' or 'would you like to avoid . . .') is also in accordance with our wish to discover the possible positive feelings of rapprochement and rapport that may exist along with the feeling of reproach and avoidance. A study which asks only about negative feelings and 'anti-white prejudices' is unlikely to discover whatever positive feelings there are.

The term "are you willing" was carefully selected in preference to "do you wish" in an effort to avoid any implication of eagerness, and the protocol explained further: "With regard to the social distance feelings we are exploring, we can guess that members of a minority may not be comfortable in mingling with members of the dominant group, not so much because of their own original distaste or hostility, but because they anticipate distaste or hostility on the part of dominant group participants in the situation." They may also not welcome the doubtful distinction of being pioneers, or in the numerical minority in unfamiliar surroundings. Moreover, frequently association is thrust upon them, without the chance of their making a choice in this matter. While these three conditions are typically involved to varying degrees for different persons in different situations, presumably an effective desegregation program would attempt to minimize their influence. So as we project our thinking into practical desegregation situations where the results of our studies could be useful, we also would like to minimize the influence of these three factors, and to get at whatever residual prejudice prevails. Therefore when we say to our respondents, "We would like to know how you feel about associating in particular situations with several kinds of white people," we add these provisos: "Please assume that you are assured in each situation where it matters, the white people involved would welcome association with Negroes and there would be many other Negroes. Also assume that you do have a choice about whether or not you are to associate with whites." Willingness for interracial participation was tested for these activities: (1) be a member of the same social club as, (2) belong to some other kind of an organization with (but not a social club), (3) marry (or have your children marry), (4) live on same block as close neighbors with, (5) participate in civil rights meetings with, (6) work on job side-by-side with, (7) be students in same school as (or have your children be students with, (8) be a member of the same religious congregation as: (provided you both share the same religion), (9) date (or have your children date), (10) have as a close friend.

The class variable was modified because the previous two-way breakdown had proven confusing. The respondent was asked each of the ten questions separately with regard to working class whites, middle class whites and upper class whites. In the personal data schedule, his own class self-designation was also asked in an open-ended question. An association index was computed by scoring yes, no and doubtful answers for the ten separate activities, totalling these scores, and then deriving their average.

Despite our carefulness in choosing what we regarded as conservative wording, (i.e., "would you be quite willing to . . ."), some respondents and student-researchers took exception to the assumptions they felt were implicit in that phrase.

> This seems to say, said one, would you cherish the chance to join a social club with whites, marry, date, etc. What many white people fail to realize is that Negroes do not want to be too close to them. Many Negroes do not want to live next door to, date, work with, or socialize with whites, they have an I don't care attitude . . .

Said another:

> The majority of my respondents took part in some sit-in demonstrations. They were called names and hit with such objects as eggs and tomatoes . . . The majority of the Negroes were only interested in associating with whites so that they could have a better life and receive all their benefits as equal people in a democratic country.

These points of view are reminiscent of James Baldwin's assertion in The Fire Next Time, that

> . . . I do not know many Negroes who are eager to be "accepted" by white people, still less to be loved by them; they, the blacks, simply don't wish to be beaten over the head by the whites every instant of our brief passage on this planet.[1]

---

[1] Baldwin, op. cit., p. 35.

Clearly, we learned from this last pre-test, that the basic question of our final instrument would have to permit more than a yes-no answer. It should call for the expression of varying intensities of feeling and a wide range of interracial attitudes. With this in mind, the present question, delineating five degrees of willingness-unwillingness, was designed, and the kinds of situations were modified and increased. Such an instrument also counteracts the tendency of subjects to acquiesce when presented with single positive-negative alternatives.

Another major modification in our present research instrument, which developed as a result of these particular pre-tests, concerned the class variable. We did find that the willingness indexes varied with regard to the respondent's own self-designated class and the class of whites involved. However, the usefulness of both the class self-designation and the class of whites replies became dubious as the varying bases on which they were made became exposed. Many called themselves middle class even when objective indices such as education, occupation and income would call for a lower designation. It was not merely, as one researcher observed, that class self-designation for some represented aspiration rather than achievement; it was also that, as another student researcher noted, "people judge their own class status by people they know." He found slum-dwellers who designated themselves "upper class" on the basis of comparisons with their neighbors, while he found others who judged their own class status on the basis of their idea of the income distribution in the national population. Other researchers had subjects who reacted with a query of their won, "Do you mean class among Negroes, or class in general?" (Obviously, class within the Negro community is another topic worth investigating in a future project.) Some distinguished between "working class" and "lower class" apparently in terms of personal and economic instability. Regardless how tactfully we tried to handle the semantics of class designation, there was considerable unwillingness to identify self in terms of the lowest in a series of class choices. "I'm as good as anybody else," said one self-respecting though impoverished old lady, who called herself "middle class."

When we tallied replies to the question about associating with different classes of whites, we found most were in favor of the middle-class whites, and least were in favor of working class whites. There was an intermediate rating given to upper class whites; but the validity of these findings also became questionable. It was evident from their comments to the researchers that many of the respondents would not have made socio-economic class distinctions among whites nor with regard to themselves had they not been required to do so by the research format. Therefore, their responses in these terms were to some extent artifacts of research. For these reasons the research design was modified so that in the present study the respondent is asked with what "kinds" of whites he is most willing to associate and with what "kinds" he is most unwilling to associate.

In an effort to introduce some refinements other than class into the gross category, "whites," at one state in the social distance testing we asked separately about attitudes toward Jews. Tentative findings suggested a bimodal distribution of Negroes' attitudes toward Jews, compared with their attitudes toward whites in general. Some were more favorably inclined toward Jews as a fellow-minority group; others, less favorably inclined to Jews, in conformity with dominant group anti-semitism, and sometimes in response to their own unfavorable experience; still others made no distinction in feeling between Jews and other whites. There are valid research problems in this area, commencing with the basic social definition of what is a Jew. More complications were evidenced than could be handled in a single study; therefore, this question was dropped.

Other trial variables which did not survive more than one semester concerned willingness to "participate in civil rights meetings" with whites, and to "belong to some other kind of organization--not a social club" with whites. Too many people who did not go to civil rights meetings themselves were unable or unwilling to postulate their feelings about sharing such a situation with whites. Too many others could not respond with regard to "other organizations" because the possibilities were too open and undefined. Thus we learned to avoid activities in our social distance list that were not both generally participated in and clearly defined.

While it was not feasible to have any overall sampling plan for these student-conducted studies, nor to draw any definitive conclusions, they did offer extensive opportunity for pre-testing and improving our instruments, and they did suggest hypotheses for the present more rigorous investigation of minority group attitudes. The very fact that many of these interviews were with friends and neighbors, and that they were conducted by non-professional Negro students affords an in-group intimacy and insight rarely available to the participant observer, let alone the naively objective outsider. There was a generally free and enthusiastic response to the investigation, as illustrated in this statement by a student-researcher in Greensboro, North Carolina:

> After I had interviewed at least five persons, my telephone at home began to ring and several persons who had heard about my research project asked if they could be interviewed. I had to tell them no, that my research sample had already been selected.

The discussions that followed the formal questionnaire often provided a deeper view of integration which contrasts with short-answer questionnaire results and common assumptions concerning the efficacy of interracial programs. For example, one case which might well appear to be eminently successful integration was not that at all. It involved a Negro lad who seemed to enjoy cordial association with many white fellow students in both high school and college, but actually he resented (not without reason) and distrusted all whites. The student-researcher tells his story in this way:

> Interviewee's family integrated white neighborhood. Interviewee was one of sixteen Negroes to integrate Roosevelt High School after the Supreme Court decision in 1954. Although there were racial incidents and conflicts, interviewee had excellent relationships with teachers and students. However, the principal testified against integration, stating that it was not working. Interviewee felt prejudice was "overt and subtle."
>
> After first six months of freshman year, interviewee was elected president of the class. He was president the remaining three years there and vice-president of the General Organization.
>
> Interviewee attended Howard University's undergraduate school. However, did not come in contact with many whites.
>
> In medical school, 25 per cent of the class was white. Interviewee was, and is, dissatisfied with whites' attitude toward Negroes. The white students are here, not because they want to be, but because of lack of money, or because their grades were not high enough to enable them to get into a white school.
>
> Interviewee cited two examples of white students not wanting to be at Howard. After the end of your sophomore year, you can transfer to almost any other medical school, if you have passed all your required boards. Over half the white students transferred after two years at Howard. The interviewee is acquainted with a white physician here in Washington who graduated from Howard Medical School. Had interviewee not heard his parents mention this fact, he would never have known. This physician does not associate himself with Howard or Freedman's Hospital.
>
> In medical school, interviewee would rather not be bothered with the white students, because "doubts their sincerity to self and all Negroes."

The following quotes illustrate some frank reactions to school integration:

> In integrated schools you had a chance to learn the bad traits of whites.
>
> Eight years of schooling isn't going to wipe out everything. ("Everything" presumably being 250 years of slavery plus minority group status.)
>
> Integrated schooling is phony--as soon as school is over you go your separate ways.

An attractive Oklahoma girl who had had many out-of-school contacts with her white school mates, had headed the local Youth Conference for Christians and Jews, had gone to Mass with her Catholic white friends and to Synagogue with her Jewish white friends and to swimming parties and dancing and "all that bit" concluded, "when it came to applying for college, I didn't want an integrated school." There were "little things I don't like about white people . . . how they dress, maybe . . . how they talk . . . how they laugh . . ."

> Even when they act friendly in school, they pretend not to see you when you meet downtown.

It became evident that what may pass for "equal status association" within the school is sometimes no personal association at all, or very limited personal association, and it often is not "equal." Following our pre-tests, we hypothesized that both white and Negro students apparently carry into the school situation the unequal social statuses that are part of the social structure and with these racial statuses come the corresponding racial attitudes; hence, friendly interracial interaction is impeded. In the present research, we ask about the actual nature of interracial association, inside and outside of school, as well as the extent of formal school desegregation.

In general, the broad coverage of the pre-tests with the variety of interviewers as well as interviewees made us very cautious about many common assumptions, such as, that increased association leads to increased acceptance. The independent clause, "I have known them" (i.e., the whites) could be followed either by "I don't want anything to do with them," or with acceptance implied in the phrase, "I know they are alike everyone else."

Thus, a summary of the preliminary findings did not yield a simple pattern of minority group prejudice. While degree of willingness to associate interracially ranged from warmth through overt hostility (with almost every respondent drawing the line somewhere, rejecting a particular kind of association or a particular kind of white person), there are also other dimensions of minority group interracial attitudes. For instance, there are different definitions of what is an important interracial issue. Some respondents were quite concerned about intimacy of contact, while others "couldn't care less," focussing instead on issues of equal opportunity and first class citizenship. Or, with regard to attitude development, some were affected by personal experiences while others conformed to rather casually adopted in-group norms.

Moreover, some of the attitudes we noted which seemed to discriminate between different races of people were really discriminating between different kinds of people, the good kinds and the bad kinds. For example, while most respondents assumed that most whites feel superior, and often act insincerely toward Negroes, many respondents also resented some Negroes who feel superior and often act insincerely toward members of their own race. Accordingly, the present research permits a comparison of "kinds of whites" who are least liked with "kinds of Negroes" who are least liked.

APPENDIX B

THE INSTRUMENT

Associating with Whites

This is a study of attitudes of Negro youths toward white people. We are mainly interested in the total picture rather than the separate answers of any one person. But, it is important that you give your own answers to this questionnaire correctly and fully, because your personal attitudes are a part of this total picture. All questionnaires are confidential and will not be seen by anyone except the research staff. We will not use your name in anything we report.

We hope that this study can help us understand more about race relations in the United States, and eventually improve these relations. Thank you very much for your help.

Directions

Our first set of questions will be about your feelings about associating in different ways with white people.

Assume that in each case the whites would be completely willing to associate with Negroes.

On the next sheet as you can see, 16 different kinds of activities are listed. Here are five different terms that tell how you may feel about being together with whites in each of these activities:

4. Completely willing.
3. Somewhat willing.
2. Not sure.
1. Somewhat unwilling.
0. Completely unwilling.

I will read off each activity. As I do, you will choose the one term that tells best how you would feel about being together with whites in this activity. Then at the right, next to each activity named, you will mark the number of the term you choose.

For example, suppose I asked you how you would feel about going to a party where about half the guests are white and half the guests are Negro. This is not one of the questions on the questionnaire but it can be used for illustration. If you would be "completely willing" to do this, you would write 4. If you would be just "somewhat willing" to do this you would write 3.

If you are "not sure," write 2; if "somewhat unwilling," write 1; or if "completely unwilling," you would write 0. Any questions?

Now, I will read the items, if you come to a problem raise your hand and I will answer your questions one at a time. I will pause for a moment, while you put down your mark.

Number ____
(col. -5)

I. ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

A. DIRECTIONS:
USING THE PROPER NUMBER FROM THE KEY
AT THE RIGHT, PLEASE MARK HOW YOU
WOULD FEEL ABOUT:

KEY:
4. completely willing
3. somewhat willing
2. unsure
1. somewhat unwilling
0. completely unwilling

1. being a member of a club where most of the members are white . . ☐
2. being a member of a club with some white members, but where most of the members are Negro . . . . ☐
3. being a member of a club where about half of the members are white, and about half are Negro . . . . ☐
4. marrying a white person . . . . ☐
5. working on a job as a boss over a white person . . . . ☐
6. working on a job under a white person . . . . ☐
7. working on a job side by side with a white person . . . . ☐
8. being a member of a church where most of the members are white . . . . ☐
9. being a member of a church where about half of the members are white, and about half are Negro . . . . ☐
10. being a member of a church with some white members, but where most of the members are Negro . . . . ☐
11. dating a white person . . . . ☐
12. having a close friend who is white . . . . ☐
13. having a school teacher who is white . . . . ☐
14. going to a school where most of the students are white . . . . ☐
15. going to a school where about half of the students are white, and abour half are Negro . . . . ☐
16. going to a school with some white students, but where most of the students are Negro . . . . ☐

(col. 6-22)

B. Any comments? Take a few minutes to jot down on the other side of this sheet any comments you care to make about any of the items above.

(col. 23-24)

C. The questions you have just answered tell how you would feel about associating with most whites in different kinds of activities. Now, please tell us:

1. Do you feel the same way towards all white people? ___Yes ___No (col. 25)

2. If "no"--then

a. With what kinds of white people would you be most willing to associate? (col. 26-27)

____
____
____
____

b. With what kinds of white people would you be most unwilling to associate? (col. 28-29)

____
____
____
____

D. The questions you have just answered tell how you feel about associating with different kinds of white people. Now just two questions about associating with different kinds of Negroes.

a. With what kinds of Negroes would you be most willing to associate? (col. 30-31)

____
____
____
____

b. With what kinds of Negroes would you be most unwilling to associate? (col. 32-33)

Number____________

Name____________________
(Please Print)

II. BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire asks for some background information to go along with the attitude questionnaire you just filled out. We ask your name only so we can select some people for follow-up interviews. Your name will not be used in any report we make.

1. Your age____ (col. 34)
2. Your sex: __Male __ Female (col. 35)
3. Now married? __Yes __No (col. 36)
4. a. Birthplace: city (or town) and state____________ ____________________ (col. 37-40)

   b. Have you lived for more than one year in any other place? __Yes __No
      1. Place____________________from age___to age___
      2. Place____________________from age___to age___
      3. Place____________________from age___to age___
      4. Place____________________from age___to age___

5. With whom do you usually live at home? (Circle one or more letters) (col. 41)
   a. mother
   b. father
   c. stepmother
   d. stepfather
   e. other. Who?____________________

The next few questions (6-11) are about your mother and father, if you live with them. If you live with your stepfather or stepmother, or foster father or foster mother, answer for him or her.

6. Education (Please circle last year school completed)
   a. Father:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4 5-or more
grammar school	high school	college

____
don't know (col. 42-44)

b. Mother:
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 grammar school   1 2 3 4 high school   1 2 3 4 5-or more college

____ don't know   (col. 45-47)

c. Yourself:
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 grammar school   1 2 3 4 high school   1 2 3 4 5-or more college

____ don't know   (col. 48-5)

7. Is your mother employed outside of your home? (Circle only one letter) (col. 51)

a. yes, steady job
b. yes, but not steady job
c. no, but looking for work
d. no, retired
e. no, unable to work
f. no, but not looking for work because____________________
g. there is no mother, stepmother, or fostermother in home

8. Is your father employed outside of your home? (Circle only one letter (col. 52)

a. yes, steady job
b. yes, but not steady job
c. no, but looking for work
d. no, retired
e. no, unable to work
f. no, but not looking for work because____________________
g. there is no father, stepfather of fosterfather in home

9. When your mother works, what is her main occupation? (Give the job, not the place of work) ____________________ (col. 53-5)
Please tell exactly what kind of work she does____________________
____

10. When your father works, what is his main occupation? (Give the job, not the place of work) ____________________ (col. 56-58)
Please tell exactly what kind of work he does ____________________
____

11. Where does the family's income (money) come from? (Circle one or more letters) (col. 59)

a. father's work
b. mother's work
c. your work
d. work of other people in home. Who? ____________________
e. welfare
f. others not in home. Who? ____________________

12. If you were able to go into any kind of work you wanted to, what occupation would you choose? (Give the kind of job, not the place of work)
____ (col. 60)

13. Religion, if any: ________________________ (col. 61-63)
   a. How often did you go to church last year? (Circle one number)
      1. about every Sunday
      2. most Sundays
      3. once in a while
      4. not at all

14. School experience (Circle each number below which tells about the students in your class.) (col. 64-67)

   a. In the 12th grade--your senior year:
      1. most of the students were Negro
      2. all of the students were Negro
      3. most of the students were white
      4. about half of the students were Negro, about half were white
      5. don't remember

   b. In the 9th grade:
      1. most of the students were Negro
      2. all of the students were Negro
      3. most of the students were white
      4. about half of the students were Negro, about half were white
      5. don't remember

   c. In the 6th grade:
      1. most of the students were Negro
      2. all of the students were Negro
      3. most of the students were white
      4. about half of the students were Negro, about half were white
      5. don't remember

   d. In the third grade:
      1. most of the students were Negro
      2. all of the students were Negro
      3. most of the students were white
      4. about half of the students were Negro, about half were white
      5. don't remember

15. Dealings with white fellow-students (Circle each number below which tells about your dealings at any time with white fellow students.) (col. 68-69)
   a. In school
      0. there were no white fellow-students
      1. nothing to do with them outside of class
      2. sometimes talked or played together, outside of class (but in school)
      3. often did special things together, like lunch or clubs
      4. good friends

b. Out of school
- 0. there were no white fellow-students
- 1. nothing to do with them out of school
- 2. sometimes did things together
- 3. did things together lots of times
- 4. close friends

16. Was your teacher (or any of your teachers, if there were more than one) a white person when you were in the: (col. 70)

a. 12th grade _____Yes _____No _____Don't remember
b. 9th grade _____Yes _____No _____Don't remember
c. 6th grade _____Yes _____No _____Don't remember
d. 3rd grade _____Yes _____No _____Don't remember

17. Rating your teachers

a. Were most of your white teachers (Circle one number) (col. 71-72)
- 1. able and willing to help you?
- 2. able to help you, but not willing?
- 3. willing to help you, but not able?
- 4. neither able nor willing to help you?
- 5. no white teachers in your classes.

b. Were most of your Negro teachers (Circle one number)
- 1. able and willing to help you?
- 2. able to help you, but not willing?
- 3. willing to help you, but not able?
- 4. neither able nor willing to help you?
- 5. no Negro teachers in your classes.

18. What do you think is the most important thing that has made you feel the way you do about whites? (On the other side of the sheet, please write both what this thing was and how it made you feel--for instance, did it make you like whites more, or trust them less, or such?) (col. 73-74)

APPENDIX C

THE SERENDIPITOUS EXPERIMENT

In the course of conducting a study concerning the interracial attitudes of Negro youth in Washington, D. C., the principal investigator, a white person, customarily absented herself from the room where the questionnaires were being administered by a Negro research assistant to assembled groups of Negro youths. This policy was based on the common-sense assumption that the presence of a white person might bias the subjects' responses, and on the findings of several experiments involving both performance on cognitive tasks[1] and racial issues[2] where the "color" of the experimenter had proved to be an influential variable.

One morning as the principal investigator was preparing to leave a particular vocational high school directly after pre-arranging with school officials for questionnaire administration but directly before the actual assembling of the students, the school official asked her why she was leaving. The investigator explained that for research reasons it was not desirable to have a white person in charge, or even present. The official--herself a Negro--replied in surprise, "But you're Negro, aren't you?"

---

[1] Katz, Roberts, and Robinson, loc. cit.; Katz, Robinson, Epps, and Waly, loc. cit.

[2] Trent, loc. cit., pp. 281-87.

The likelihood of this misidentification had not occurred before to the principal investigator who is a dark-complexioned Caucasoid with non-Negroid features. But the school official insisted that the students would share the assumption that she was Negro and urged the principal investigator to stay. The principal investigator then decided to try to test this assumption of Negroness and asked permission to do so after the questionnaire had been administered in her absence by the Negro research assistant. Permission was granted. The "instant research" which was then designed and promptly carried through almost exactly as designed, is here presented:

When the 61 students had completed the 45-minute questionnaire, the Negro research assistant said, "Now I want to introduce Mrs. M __________ of Howard University who is working with me on this research." (The phrase "working with me" was deliberate; Howard University is a predominantly Negro school well-known in the area.) Mrs. M _________ stood, smiling, but saying nothing. The students appeared unsure what response was expected of them, but then started to applaud. The research assistant continued, "We would like to ask you to do one more thing now. Would you please write down on the back of your questionnaires whether you think Mrs. M _________ is Negro or white." Slight (embarrassed?) laughter and a small crisis ensued: the questionnaires had already been collected by a zealous school official and the respondents had to hunt for small scraps of paper on which to write. Then, many of the students, seated in awkward locations behind pillars and in corners, craned to see Mrs. M _________ more clearly. Mrs. M _________ obliged by walking through the assemblage. She continued smiling, still wordlessly.

At this stage the research assistant announced, "And now Mrs. M ________ would like to say a few words to you." At the microphone Mrs. M _________ warmly expressed her gratitude for the subjects' cooperation, her pleasure at being in their school, and her willingness to answer any questions that they would care to ask about the research. "But before I do, one last request: You've already written down whether you think Mrs. M ________ --that's me--is 'white' or 'Negro.' Please don't change whatever you've written, but put a number '1' in front of it. Then under that '1' write '2' and then, please, next to that '2' write at this moment what you think Mrs. M ________ is: 'white' or 'Negro.'"

The papers were then collected. Results were tallied in five categories:

A. 1. white; 2. white
B. 1. Negro; 2. Negro
C. 1. white; 2. Negro
D. 1. Negro; 2. white
E. Other

Our hunch--"hypothesis" would be too grand a term for so informal an inquiry--was that the D category would be the most numerous. The reasons for this hunch included the strength of the school official's impression that the investigator was Negro plus the investigator's own assumption that even a strong initial impression would not withstand (a) the challenge to re-consider, or (b) the additional evidence of Mrs. M ________'s uncolloquial diction. Our hunch was wrong. The actual tally was:

A.	WW	15
B.	NN	18
C.	WN	6
D.	NW	6
E.	Other	12
	Total	57[1]

---

[1] The total number of slips collected fell four short of the 61 questionnaires collected a few minutes earlier.

Contrary to expectation, category B is the most numerous. Moreover, at some point in the inquiry almost three-fourths of the respondants (all but 15 of the 57 replying) were not willing to respond in terms of the simple stereotype "white."

When this experiment was replicated another day, with the same principal investigator, another Negro research assistant, and a sample of 26 out-of-school Negro youths, their responses tallied:

A.	WW	2
B.	NN	12
C.	WN	2
D.	NW	6
E.	Other	4
	Total	26

Here too, even more than in the original sample, almost all respondents (24 out of 26) were unwilling simply to identify the respondent as "white."

Whatever the limitations of these two experiments--and some of their shortcomings are footnoted below[1] they do clearly establish the likelihood of incongruency between the researcher's self-perception and the subjects' perception of him. They also suggest an incongruency in conceptions and vocabulary. For while the researcher instructed the subjects to use one of only two terms--"white" or "Negro"--many of the respondents were unwilling to confine themselves to these two terms. This was true not only in the case tallied as "other" because they wrote "other" or "neither" or "foreign"--or "she's a nice lady and I don't care whether she's white or Negro." It was also true in the following which were tallied as Negro: "mixed," "half and half"; "half white and half-colored"; "from Negro and white ancestry"; "Negro of Far East descent"; "Negro but she has some Caucasion blood" and finally, these two responses on one slip: "1. She's a Negro and if she's not she has more Negro in her than white; 2. Negro blood very much." (The write-ins of "Jew" and "Caucasoid" were both tallied as white.) All the implications of the incongruencies are not clear, but they do raise broad interracial issues, as well as specialized methodological ones.

---

[1] It is possible that incidentals of the research design produced artifacts of research, or at least biased the results. For example, it is possible that many respondents in both samples would never have given a conscious thought to the racial identification of the principal investigator if they had not been required to do so. Perhaps race is not so constant a factor in the social psychological "set" of all Negro youth but a kind of latent factor, to be triggered off only under special circumstances. On the other hand, the research intervention could have produced responses contrary to the respondent's initial inclinations, because the very act of questioning may have made respondents insecure about their initial inclinations. The possibilities of these distortions call for improved research design.

In interracial contacts in general, it would appear that racial identifications are not based mainly on the perception of discreet, popularly recognized physical clues, but on a complicated network of non-verbal communication and the total social situation in which it occurs. For instance, it would appear that the most salient clues selected by the youths in our two experiments did not have to do with physical appearance, but situational factors, e.g., the fact that the questionnaire focussed confidentially on Negro feelings, that the p.i. came from a predominantly Negro university, that the research assistant was clearly Negro, and, most likely, that her own interpersonal manner communicated an intimate we-feeling in a Negro in-group.

Indeed, interpersonal manner may be the crucial clue in racial identification, but it is hard to define or even describe under any circumstances. It is doubly complicated in interracial situations because a "double entendre" of racial significance can be read into any gesture. It is not entirely deliberate, or even conscious. For instance, the p.i. did not fully recognize the tenor of her own non-verbal communication until she re-enacted for a colleague her "performance" in the experiment. The colleague observed that her wordless approach--walk and smile--seemed to insinuate a privately shared understanding; the smile was "almost a wink." We are reminded of Edward E. Jones' "tactics of ingratiation"[1] and Goffman's "aligning collusive wink"[2] which breaks the status barrier. Goffman's discussion of how communication between members of different teams is ordinarily confined to established, narrow channels applies to interracial encounters. Just as open and candid communication is customarily not possible for members of different teams it is customarily not possible for Negroes and whites. It would be "out of character" for a white person to invite Negroes to judge her racial identity; therefore a person who does so with apparent candor and intimacy, is, ipso facto, not white.

The research question, on what bases do Negroes make racial identifications of strangers would be a useful topic for further empirical inquiry.

---

[1] Edward E. Jones, Kenneth Gergen, and Robert Jones, Tactics of Ingratiation Among Leaders and Subordinates in a Status Hierarchy ("Psychological Monographs," Vol. LXXVII, 1963).

[2] Goffman, op. cit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, Gordon and Kramer, B. M. "Some Roots of Prejudice." *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXII (July, 1946).

_______. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1955.

Antonovsky, Anthony. "Social Meaning of Discrimination." *Phylon*, XXI (September, 1960), 81-95.

Baldwin, James. *The Fire Next Time*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., August, 1964.

Banks, William S., II. "Rank Order of Sensitivity to Discriminations of Negroes in Columbus, Ohio." *American Sociological Review*, XV (August, 1950), 529-34.

Bayton, J. A. "The Racial Stereotypes of Negro College Students." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XXXVI (1941), 97-102.

Bayton, J. A., and Byoune, E. F. "Racio-National Stereotypes Held by Negroes." *Journal of Negro Education*, XVI (January, 1947), 49-56.

Bayton, J. A., Austin, L. J., and Burke, Kaye. "Negro Perceptions of Negro and White Personality Traits." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, I (March, 1965), 250-53.

Bayton, J. A., McAlister, L. B., and Hamer, J. "Race-Class Stereotypes." *Journal of Negro Education*, XXV (Winter, 1956), 75-78.

Bettelheim, Bruno, and Janowitz, Morris. *Dynamics of Prejudice* New York: Harper & Bros., 1950.

Boynton, Paul L., and George D. Mayo. "A Comparison of Certain Attitudinal Responses of White and Negro High School Students." *Journal of Negro Education*, XI (October, 1942), 487-94.

Brink, William, and Harris, Louis. *The Negro Revolution in America*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964.

Brookover, Wilbur B., and Holland, John B. "An Inquiry into the Meaning of Minority Attitude Expressions." *American Sociological Review*, XVII (April, 1952), 196-202.

Brown, Warren, and Alers, J. Osca. "Attitudes of Whites and Non-Whites Toward Each Other." *Sociology and Social Research*, XL (May-June, 1956), 312-19.

Campbell, Ernest Q. "Moral Discomfort and Racial Segregation on Examination of the Myrdal Hypothesis." Social Forces, XXXIX (March, 1961), 228-34.

Carter, Charles A., and Mitchell, Lonnie E. "Attitudes of Negro Pupils Toward Whites." Journal of Human Relations, IV (Spring, 1956), 98-99.

Clark, K. B. "Racial Prejudice Among American Minorities." International Social Science Bulletin, II (1950), 506-13.

———. Dark Ghetto. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Clark, K. B., and Clark, M. P. "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Pre-School Children." Journal of Social Psychology, X (1939), 591-99.

———. "Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children." Journal of Negro Education, XIX (1950), 341-50.

Cothran, Tilman. "Negro Stereotyped Conceptions of White People." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1949.

———. "Negro Conceptions of White People." American Journal of Sociology, LVI (March, 1951), 458-67.

———. "Negro Stereotyped Conceptions of the White Liberal." Arkansas Academy of Science Proceedings, IV (1951), 123-29.

De Fleur, M. L., and Westie, F. R. "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Act: An Experiment on the Salience of Attitudes." American Sociological Review, XXIII (1958), 667-73.

Drake, St. Clair. "The Social and Economic Status of the Negro in the United States." Daedalus, XCIV (Fall, 1965), 781-84.

Edlefsen, J. B. "Social Distance Attitudes of Negro College Students." Phylon, XVII (First Quarter, 1956), 79-83.

Frazier, E. Franklin. Race and Cultural Contacts in the Modern World. Boston: Beacon Press, 1957.

Goffman, Erving. Behavior in Public Places. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Goodman, Leo A., and Druskal, William K. "Measures of Association for Cross Classifications." Journal of the American Statistical Association, LIX (September, 1954), 732-69.

Gray, J. Stanley, and Thompson, Anthony H. "Ethnic Prejudices of White and Negro College Students." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, XLVIII (April, 1953), 311-13.

Greenberg, H., Chase, A. L., and Cannon, T. M., Jr. "Attitudes of White and Negro High School Students in a West Texas Town Toward School Integration." Journal of Applied Psychology, XLI (February, 1957) 27-31.

Hare, Nathan. The Black Anglo-Saxons. New York: Marzani and Munsell, 1965.

Hill, Mozell C. "Basic Racial Attitudes Toward Whites in Oklahoma All-Negro Community." American Journal of Sociology, XLIX (May, 1944), 519.

________. "A Comparative Study of Race Attitudes in the All-Negro Community in Oklahoma." Phylon (Third Quarter, 1946).

Himmelhoch, Jerome. "Tolerance and Personality Needs: A Study of the Liberation of Ethnic Attitudes Among Minority Group College Students." American Sociological Review, XV (February, 1960), 79-88.

Holmes, J. B. "A Study of Racial Attitudes Found in Four Colleges, Including a Scale to Measure these Attitudes." Journal of Negro Education, XI (August, 1942), 487-94.

Howard, David. "An Exploratory Study of Negro Professionals Toward Competition with Whites." Social Forces, XLV (September, 1966), 20-27.

Hughes, Everett C., and Hughes, Helen M. Where Peoples Meet. Glencoe: Free Press, 1952.

Johnson, Charles S. Growing Up in the Black Belt. Washington: American Council on Education, 1941.

________. Patterns of Negro Segregation. New York: Harper & Bros., 1943.

Johnson, Robert B. "Negro Reaction to Minority Group Status." American Minorities. Edited by Milton L. Barron. New York: A. Knopf Co., 1957.

Killian, Lewis M., and Grigg, Charles M. "Rank Orders of Discrimination of Negroes and Whites in a Southern City." Social Forces, XXXIX (March, 1961), 235-39.

Kvaraceus, William C. The Relationship of Education to Self-Concept in Negro Children and Youths. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Lomax, Louis E. The Negro Revolt. New York: Harper & Bros., 1962.

McDaniel, Paul A., and Babchuk, Nicholas. "Negro Conceptions of White People in a Northeastern City." Phylon, XXI (Spring, 1960), 7-19.

McDowell, Sophia Fagin. "Use of the Myrdal Concept of 'An American Dilemma' With Regard to the Race Problem in the United States." Social Forces, XXX (October, 1951), 87-91.

Marks, Eli S. "Standardization of Race Attitude Tests for Negro Youth." Journal of Social Psychology, XVIII (May, 1943), 245-78.

Marx, Gary T. Protest and Prejudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community. To be published October, 1967 by Harper & Row.

Matthews, Donald R., and Prothro, James W. "Southern Racial Attitudes: Conflict, Awareness, and Political Change." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, CCCXLIV (November, 1962), 108-21.

Mays, Nebraska. "Behavioral Expectations of Negro and White Teachers in Recently Desegregated Public School Facilities." The Journal of Negro Education, XXXII (Summer, 1963), 218-26.

Meenes, Max. "A Comparison of Racial Stereotypes of 1935-1942." Journal of Social Psychology, XVII (May, 1943), 327-36.

Myrdal, Gunnar. An American Dilemma. New York: Harper & Row, 1944.

"The Negro American." Daedalus, Vol. XCIV, special issue (Fall, 1965).

"Negro American Personality." Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XX special issue (April, 1964).

"The Negro in America." Newsweek, July 29, 1963.

Noel, Donald L., and Pinkney, Alphonso. "Correlates of Prejudice: Some Racial Differences and Similarities." American Journal of Sociology, LXIX (May, 1964), 609-22.

Park, Robert E. Race and Culture. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950.

Parsons, Talcott, and Clark, Kenneth B. (eds.). The Negro American. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Passow, A. Harry (ed.). Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. A Profile of the Negro American. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1964.

Prothro, E. T., and Jensen, J. A. "Group Differences in Ethnic Attitudes of Louisiana College Students." Sociology and Social Research, XXIV (January-February, 1950), 252-58.

Prothro, E. T., and Miles, Otha K. "Social Distance in the Deep South as Measured By a Revised Bogardus Scale." Journal of Social Psychology, XXXVII (May, 1953), 171-74.

Roberts, H. W. "The Impact of Military Service Upon the Racial Attitude of Negro Servicemen in World War II." Social Problems, I (June, 1953), 65-69.

________. "Prior-Service Attitudes Toward Whites of 219 Negro Veterans." Journal of Negro Education, XXII (Fall, 1953), 455-65.

Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Roucek, Joseph S. "Minority-Majority Relations in the Power Aspects." Phylon, XVII (March, 1956), 24-30.

Shaw, Marvin E., and Wright, Jack M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.

Sherif, M. "Superordinate Goals in Reduction of Intergroup Conflict." *American Journal of Sociology*, LXII (January, 1958), 349-56.

Shuler, Edgar A. "Attitudes Toward Racial Segregation in Baton Rouge, Louisiana." *The Journal of Social Psychology*, XVII (August, 1943), 33-53.

Simpson, George E., and Yinger, V. Milton. *Racial and Cultural Minorities*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Simpson, Richard L. "Negro-Jewish Prejudice: Authoritarianism and Social Variables as Correlates." *Social Problems*, VII (Fall, 1959), 138-46.

Steckler, G. A. "Authoritarian Ideology in Negro College Students." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, LIV (1957), 396-99.

Stember, Charles H. *Education and Attitude Change*. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1961.

Trent, R. D. "The Relation Between Expressed Self-Acceptance and Expressed Attitudes Toward Negroes and Whites Among Negro Children." *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, XCI (September, 1957), 25-31.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. Office of Education. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, by James S. Coleman *et al*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Westie, Frank R. "Negro-White Status Differentials and Social Distance." *American Sociological Review*, XVII (October, 1952), 50-58.

________. "A Technique for the Measurement of Race Attitudes." *American Sociological Review*, XVIII (February, 1953), 73-78.

Westie, Frank R., and Howard, David. "Social Status Differentials and the Race Attitudes of Negroes." *The American Sociological Review*, XIX (October, 1954), 584-91.

Westie, Frank R., and Westie, Margaret L. "The Social Distance Pyramid: Relationships Between Caste and Class." *American Journal of Sociology*, LXIII (September, 1957).

"What the White Man Thinks of the Negro Revolt." *Newsweek*, special issue, October 21, 1963.

"The White Problem in America." *Ebony*, special issue, August, 1965.

Williams, Robin *et al*. *Strangers Next Door*. Princeton, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964.

Works, Ernest. "The Prejudice-Interaction Hypothesis from the Point of View of the Negro Minority Group." *American Journal of Sociology*, LXVII (July, 1961), 47-52.

OE-BR

ND
must

FROM:

ERIC FACILITY
SUITE 601
1735 EYE STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006